FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-209
Tuesday
31 October 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-209

CONTENTS

31 October 1989

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Akhromeyev Notes U.S. Resistance to Naval Cuts *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 1
Nazarkin Discusses Progress of Geneva Arms Talks *[PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 3
United Nations Resumes Chemical Weapons Talks 4
    TASS Announces Opening *[TASS]* 4
    Batsanov on Strengthening Security *[TASS]* 4
Chervov Says More Military Cuts 'Possible' *[TASS]* 5

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

More on Pact Foreign Ministers Meeting 6
    Aboymov Discusses Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 6
    Economic Discussion *[TASS]* 6
    Joint Pact Policies *[TASS]* 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 30 Oct 7
    Nicaragua Situation 7
    Latest COCOM Session 7
    Loncar Visit 7
    Summary of Briefing 7
Panel Focuses on Gorbachev Visit to Finland *[Moscow International]* 8
International Meeting Examines Nuclear Accidents *[TASS]* 11
Adamishin Meets With UNESCO Head *[IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]* 11
Petrovskiy Meets With IAEA Director Blix *[TASS]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Primakov, Delegation Hold Talks During U.S Visit 12
    Meeting With Bush, Congress *[PRAVDA 28 Oct]* 12
    More on Primakov's Activities *[PRAVDA 29 Oct]* 12
    Senate Leaders, Primakov Comment *[PRAVDA 29 Oct]* 13
    Congressmen Interviewed *[TASS]* 14
Yazov Interviewed, Discusses Recent U.S. Visit *[Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA 26 Oct]* 14

China

Jiang Says PRC Opposed to Exporting Revolution *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 16
PRAVDA Views Developing USSR-PRC Ties *[31 Oct]* 16
Soviet, Chinese UN Associations Meet in Moscow *[Moscow International]* 18

Near East & South Asia

Falin Receives South Yemen Party Delegation *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 18
PDRY's Al-'Attas Lauds Ties on Treaty Anniversary *[Moscow Radio]* 18
Soviet-PDRY Cooperation Talks Held in Aden *[TASS]* 18

Sub-Saharan Africa

Gorbachev Envoy Meets With Ethiopia's Mengistu *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 19

East Europe

- Hungarian, Polish Roles in Warsaw Pact Viewed 19
    - Primakov Rules Out Interference *[Budapest Radio]* 19
    - More on Primakov, Shishlin Comments *[Budapest TV]* 19
    - Aboymov on Pact Countries' Commitment *[Budapest Radio]* 19
- APN Cited on USSR Intervention in Hungary *[TANJUG]* 19
- Moscow TV Queries Egon Krenz on GDR 'Renewal' *[Moscow TV]* 20
- TASS Cites ADN on Krenz Address to Officers 22
- GDR Authorities' Response to Demonstrations Noted *[IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]* 22
- IZVESTIYA Notes Decisions, Changes in GDR *[29 Oct]* 23
- Shevardnadze Interviewed on Perestroyka, Changes *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 27-29 Oct]* 23
- Shevardnadze 25 Oct Remarks to PAP Published *[TRYBUNA LUDU 28-29 Oct]* 26
- Polish Group Arrives in Katyn, Visits Memorial *[Warsaw PAP]* 26
- Embassy Official Comments on Katyn, Relations *[Warsaw SZTANDAR MLODYCH 20-22 Oct]* . 27
- PZPR Commission Cited on Economic Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 29 Oct]* 30
- Soviet, Polish Deputy Premiers View Trade Outlook *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 31
    - Criticism of CEMA 'Fully Justified' *[PAP]* 31
- PZPR Strictures on Representation, Economy Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Oct]* 31
- Future Direction of Polish Foreign Policy Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 32
- SFRY's Loncar Arrives; Met by Shevardnadze *[TASS]* 32
    - TANJUG on Loncar Arrival 32
- CSSR Agency Cited on Foreign 'Provocateurs' *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 33
    - RUDE PRAVO Cited on Demonstration *[Moscow International]* 33

West Europe

- Estonian Party Leader Talks With Koivisto *[Helsinki Radio]* 33
- Yakovlev Meets With Finnish Youths 27 Oct *[PRAVDA 28 Oct]* 33
- PRAVDA Account of Shevardnadze-Sodano Talks *[21 Oct]* 34
- Karpov, Danish Delegation Meet on Disarmament *[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]* 34
- Karpov, Swedish Ambassador Discuss Vienna Talks *[TASS]* 34
- FRG Parliamentarian on Visit, Security Issues *[IZVESTIYA 17 Oct]* 35
- Bid To Change West Berlin's 'Status' Hit *[PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 35
- Katushev Chairs USSR-UK Cooperation Session *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 35
- UK Labour Party's Current Popularity Examined *[Moscow TV]* 35
- Compensation for UK's 'Guildford Four' Urged *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 36
- CPSU Delegation Attends Irish CP Congress *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 36
    - CPSU Greetings *[PRAVDA 27 Oct]* 36
- French Communists Study CPSU Agrarian Policy *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 36
- Voronin Talks With Turkish Finance Minister *[IZVESTIYA 20 Oct]* 36

Latin America & Caribbean

- Ryzhkov Greets Soviet-Latin American Meeting *[TASS]* 37
- Expert Views Soviet Aid to Cuba, Nicaragua *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 37

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

- Gorbachev Opens 30 Oct Supreme Soviet *[Moscow TV]* 41
- Supreme Soviet Discusses State Plan, Budget *[TASS]* 41
    - Further on Budget Discussion *[TASS]* 42
- Report on Kucherenko Speech *[Moscow TV]* 42
- Moscow TV Carries 30 Oct Supreme Soviet Session 47
    - 1600 GMT 47
    - 1740 GMT 47
    - 1946 GMT 47
    - 2029 GMT 48
    - 2101 GMT 49
- Gorbachev Concluding Remarks at 30 Oct Session *[Moscow TV]* 49
- Supreme Soviet Resumes; Changes Schedule 31 Oct *[TASS]* 50

Political & Social

Demonstrators Surround Moscow KGB Headquarters 51
  Create 'Confusion' *[Moscow Radio]* 51
  Police Disperse Anti-KGB Protest *[AFP]* 51
  Forty Detained *[AFP]* 51
Director of Strikebound Vorkuta Mine Replaced *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 31 Oct]* 52
  Strike 'Double-Edged Sword' *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 52
  Further on Strike *[TASS]* 53
  Voronin on Striking Miners *[Moscow TV]* 53
23 Oct Gorbachev Speech to Economists *[PRAVDA 30 Oct]* 54
Gremitskikh Interviewed on Perestroyka, Autonomy *[Vienna TV]* 63
KGB Officials Discuss Restructuring Activities *[TASS]* 64
PRAVDA Editorial on 'Press Responsibility' *[31 Oct]* 65
PRAVDA's Frolov Meets Foreign Journalists *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Oct]* 66
  Says PRAVDA To Adopt New Style *[AFP]* 66
Baltic Discussions on Banks, Currency Cited *[IZVESTIYA 31 Oct]* 67
Division of Lithuanian Youth Leagues Urged *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 67
Lithuanian Monitoring Service Featured *[Vilnius International]* 69
Independent Radio Station Set Up in Vilnius *[Vilnius International]* 70
Reportage on Ukraine Supreme Soviet 10th Session 71
  Deputies Remarks, Debate Noted *[Kiev International]* 71
  Resolutions, Elections Set *[Kiev International]* 72
Pavlychkov Wins Kalush By-Election *[Kiev International]* 72
'Green World' Movement Founded in Ukraine *[TASS]* 72
Moldavian Green Movement Founded 29 Oct *[TASS]* 73
Correction to 'Moldavian Presidium on Draft Laws' *[Moscow Radio]* 73
Russian Movement Seeks 'National Consensus' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct]* 73
Crimean AES To Be Converted to Training Base *[IZVESTIYA 28 Oct]* 76
Azerbaijan People's Front Official Interviewed *[Baku KOMMUNIST 28 Sep]* 76
Correspondent on Situation in Stepanakert *[Moscow TV]* 77
New Uzbek Land, Water Minister Named *[SOVET OZBEKISTONI 17 Oct]* 77
'Generations Link' Society Forms in Dushanbe *[TASS]* 77
Further Reforms Urged in Party Apparatus *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 78
Party Needs Dialogue With 'Informals' *[PRAVDA 10 Oct]* 79
Worker Urges Renewal of Party Apparatus *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Oct]* 80
Scientists, Intelligentsia Form Informals *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 20 Oct]* 82
Mass Held for Victims of Stalin Purges *[TASS]* 83
Ban on Individual Radio Sets Lifted *[IZVESTIYA 30 Oct]* 84
Detective Agencies Unite, Form Group *[TASS]* 84

Economic

Commission Member Questions Budget Allocations *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 22 Oct]* 84
Commentator Praises Ruble Devaluation *[Berger in IZVESTIYA 26 Oct]* 87
Economic Statistics, 'Ineffective' Reform Cited *[Markovnikov on Moscow International]* 88
Foreign Trade Figures Released, Examined *[Moscow Maritime Press]* 88
Arctic Fleet Ends Work, Chartered in Pacific *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Oct]* 88

Military

Official Discusses Aims and Tasks of 'Shield' *[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]* 89
Weapons Stolen From Military Unit Near Moscow *[PRAVDA 24 Oct]* 89
'Experienced Crew' Involved in Kamchatka Air Crash *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Oct]* 90
Party Aktiv Discusses Bullying, Other Problems *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* 90
Military Training Chiefs Address Conference *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* 90

Akhromeyev Notes U.S. Resistance to Naval Cuts

*PM2910203589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
30 Oct 89 First Edition p 7*

[Article by Marshal of the Soviet Union S. Akhromeyev: "The USSR Favors Dialogue and Cooperation. But What About the United States?"]

[Text] **Relations between the Soviet Union and the United states have improved considerably over the last four years. The level of military rivalry has declined, a number of problems concerning the reduction of nuclear armaments has been resolved, and military tension in the world has diminished. Here the Soviet Union and the United States have displayed realism and have arrived at a shared understanding of the ruinous consequences of nuclear war under contemporary conditions, and of the need to reduce the level of the sides' armaments and armed forces. But life goes on, and it is necessary to know what awaits us in the 1990's at the talks on reducing nuclear and conventional armaments, and, consequently, also in relations between the USSR and the United States.**

Soon after the defeat of Hitler's Germany and militarist Japan in World War II, following the Potsdam Conference which took the basic collective decisions for the popstwar setup, the "Big Four" (the USSR, the United States, Great Britian, and France) broke up. Fundamental differences arose between the USSR on the one hand, and the United States, Great Britain, and France on the other. Following the socialist transformations in the countries of East and Central Europe and the victory of the socialist revolution in China, these differences grew into confrontation between the socialist and capitalist countries. The end of the 1940's saw the start of the "cold war" which led to the formation of the military-political blocs. Major military measures accompanied the political antagonism. Both the United States and the USSR moved swiftly to perfect and build up their nuclear weapons.

In 1949 the NATO bloc was formed. By the mid-1950's it had assumed the form in which it exists today. The military-political encirclement of the Soviet Union and its allies was complete; there had taken shape the constant threat with which the Soviet Union and its allies would, in the most serious manner, have to contend.

In response to the actions of the United States (and sometimes first) the Soviet Union also began to carry out military measures. It did not possess the capacity to pose a military threat to the United States such as that posed by the latter to the USSR. At that time, the Soviet leadership had the good sense not to initiate a race with the United States to create a navy and a strategic air force. The USSR and its European allies opted for a different path. They deployed on their territory in Europe a powerful grouping of land—chiefly tank—forces and created (in response to the threat from the United States) a military threat to the U.S. allies in West Europe. In 1955 the Warsaw Treaty Organization was formed as a military-political alliance. The Soviet Union and its allies were unprotected against ocean- or sea-borne aggression. In its turn, the United States was restrained by its European allies from a military attack upon the USSR. A situation of mutual military—and particularly nuclear—deterrence had taken shape. From 1955 through 1985 the situation altered. The changes were very major ones. But as a whole, the military-political situation which had taken shape in the mid-50's remained essentially the same by the mid-80's.

As a result, three categories of military forces of enormous power had taken definitive shape by the middle of the 80's: the strategic nuclear armaments of the USSR and the United States and—albeit much less powerful—of Great Britain, France, and China; the armed forces of the two military alliances in Europe; the naval forces of these same two alliances on the seas and oceans. From 1969 through 1985, negotiations—successful and unsuccessful—took place on the future of these three forces and their influence on the world situation. Negotiations on them will also have to be held in the 1990's. The military threat posed by them affects the most vital interests of the North Atlantic alliance states and the Warsaw Pact states alike. Just how have events unfolded since 1985? Following M.S. Gorbachev's assumption of the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in the spring of 1985 and the formation of a new state leadership, the military antagonism and the impasse which had come about were subjected to thorough analysis in the Soviet Union. In pursuing the perestroyka of its own society the USSR had, even by the 1st half of 1986, arrived at conclusions which radically changed its foreign policy. In pursuing the demilitarization, democratization, and deideologization of its foreign policy the Soviet Union excluded from it any strong-arm pressure as a means of achieving political goals. A new military doctrine was elaborated and introduced in the USSR in 1987 in line with the new foreign policy principles, and a single military doctrine for the Warsaw Pact was adopted. In accordance with this the USSR and its allies have declared that: Under no circumstances would they be the first to attack anyone; they would never be the first to resort to nuclear waepons; they do not consider any state or any people to be their enemy; they have no territorial claims against anyone. The Soviet Union is carrying out the training of its armed forces in accordance with this doctrine. During 1989-1990 the USSR is unilaterally cutting its armed forces by 500,000 men (as of 1 October this year they had already been reduced by more than 200,000 men). The army and navy are being restructured into a defensive configuration. All this is being done in conditions of broad openness and glasnost.

After the summit meetings at Geneva and Rejkyavik between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in 1985-1986, where the Soviet Union's fundamental foreign policy decisions were realized in practical terms, negotiations proceeded more successfully. They led to the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles of the USSR and the United States. This treaty is now being successfully implemented. E.A. Shevardnadze's talks with President G. Bush and Secretary of State J. Baker in September this year have helped to move forward the problem of strategic offensive arms.

The USSR has moved to accommodate its negotiating partners on a question which is the subject of special anxiety for the states of West Europe belonging to the NATO bloc. We and our allies have agreed to a radical reduction of ground forces and air forces in Europe and to the establishment for both military alliances of an identical level of force strengths and of armaments for them. Our country has agreed to examine at separate talks the solution of the problem of the sides' naval forces and armaments.

So how have the United States and its partners in the military bloc been acting at the same time? To give them their due, they gave a positive reception to the abrupt turn in the Soviet Union's foreign policy for the purpose of reducing the danger of war in the world. The United States and its allies have embarked on businesslike negotiations. Accords have been reached on the elimination of nuclear weapons and talks have begun on the reduction of armed forces in Europe. Contacts are being effected successfully between military figures of both sides. Greater trust is emerging. All this must not be underestimated.

But a number of questions arise in connection with the policy of the United States and its allies. The United States and its allies have reacted in a unique way to the introduction by us and our allies of a defensive military doctrine and to the unilateral reduction of the Warsaw Pact Armed Forces by 600,000 men. For all the western diversity of opinions and assessments with regard to the Soviet Union actions, the chief factors in military circles there still doubt the trustworthiness of the new doctrine and as to the reality of the force cuts, and frequently even direct accusations of deception leveled against us. This line of conduct would seem absurd. Our military doctrine is an open one, NATO bloc observers and inspectors attend our troop exercises, and the reductions of our troops and naval forces are being conducted openly and in real terms. We are providing the necessary explanations. But no, they do not believe us. Why? From the viewpoint of their selfish interests the United States and the NATO bloc do have grounds for such conduct. After all, if they were to tell the world the truth and admit that we really have moved over to a defensive doctrine, the public of the West European countries, and of the United States itself, would raise the question of altering the aggressive military doctrines of the NATO bloc ("flexible response" and "nuclear deterrence") also. That is just what the United States does not want to do!

It is striving not to acknowledge the reality of our reduction of our armed forces. For if it is acknowledged, it would be time for the NATO bloc, too, to start the unilateral reduction of its armed forces. But they fear such a reduction like the plague.

The policy of NATO's leading states is also inconsistent in the matter of the elimination or reduction of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. Having agreed to a radical reduction of armed forces in Europe, in the course of which there will also be an inevitable reduction in strike aircraft and tactical missiles and artillery which are vehicles for both conventional and nuclear munitions, the countries of the NATO bloc have, de facto, agreed to the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons. But they are refusing to conduct negotiations on the reduction of these weapons. Why? They are afraid that such talks on a reduction would, under public pressure, inevitably be transformed into talks on total elimination. In that case their aggressive strategies of "flexible response" and "nuclear deterrence" would be derailed. That is where one should look for the reasons for the vacillations in the policy of the United States and its allies.

But people in the Soviet Union do remember nevertheless that talks are being conducted on problems of strategic nuclear arms and the reduction of armed forces in Europe, in which both sides have a vested interest. However, naval forces constitute one of the most important problems, and today even the most important problem, of the Soviet Union's security. How do matters stand with negotiations on this issue?

Because of U.S. opposition there are no negotiations in progress on the reduction of the sides' naval forces. The reasons given by the United States for its stance are incomprehensible, but only one answer suggests itself: It is opposed to any talks on the reduction of U.S. and Soviet naval forces for the sole reason that it has a considerable superiority over us in the forces and means at sea. Let us look at the figures.

U.S. naval forces exceed the Soviet Union's naval forces in respect of major surface vessels (battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and guided missile frigates) by a factor of 2.5, in respect of strike aircraft-carriers absolutely (United States—15, USSR—none), in naval aviation aircraft by a factor of 2.5; in overall tonnage by a factor of 2; and in naval infantry strength by a factor of 19.

Having encircled the Soviet Union for 40 years with military bases, including naval bases, and deploying ships, aircraft, force command organs, and stockpiles of material means at these bases, the United States appears to have the intention to continue to exert pressure on us by means of these forces and to threaten the Soviet Union.

President R. Reagan expressed himself frankly on this account at one time: "Superiority at sea makes it possible for us to exploit the geographical vulnerability of the Soviet Union and to create a permanent threat to Soviet interests."

But perhaps this statement is outdated and the situation is totally different now? Nothing of the sort. Admiral C.

Trost, chief of U.S. Naval Operations, addressing members of the Defense Orientation Conference Association at the end of September this year, declared: "I would prefer the naval arms control question to remain on the back burner."

Finally, quite recently Soviet representatives at talks were told that the question of naval activities was unacceptable for the United States and that the limitation or regulation of these activities on an international scale was unrealistic. Translated into simple language this statement would read: Arms reduction talks which are advantageous for the United States will be held, but the United States has no intention to engage in talks with us about the reduction of naval forces which are to its disadvantage.

The Soviet Union must draw the appropriate conclusions from this. After all, if accords are achieved at the talks with the United States on the reduction of strategic offensive arms by 50 percent, and with the NATO bloc on a radical reduction of armed forces in Europe, and if we actually reduce these forces on a reciprocal basis, while the U.S. naval forces and U.S. naval bases surrounding the USSR remain intact, the military threat for the USSR will increase and the position of the Soviet Union in the world will deteriorate. How could we agree to this?

The Soviet stance in respect to talks on reducing naval forces is clear. M.S. Gorbachev set It out in Helsinki 26 October this year: "In our opinion the confidence-building process, the reduction and subsequent complete elimination of military confrontation, and the transition to nonoffensive defense will simply not take place unless this problem is resolved."

Soviet-U.S. talks on the reduction of nuclear and conventional arms go back 20 years. They have advanced with varying success during this time. It seems that at the moment they have entered a favorable stage and that opportunities for the achievement of major accords exist. However, the U.S. stance is contradictory. While wanting us to take account of the interests and concerns of the United States and its allies, the U.S. Administration does not take account of our interests and concern at its activities on the seas, oceans, and areas close to the Soviet Union. It is obvious that in this context a long and difficult path lies ahead of the Soviet-U.S. talks on the reduction of nuclear and conventional arms. The Soviet Union is prepared to clear obstacles from this path to ensure continous progress. But is the United States prepared to do the same?

Only mutual understanding and the recognition of equal security by the sides can lead to the achievement of accords.

Nazarkin Discusses Progress of Geneva Arms Talks

*PM3010212789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
31 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5*

[Dispatch by own correspondent I. Melnikov: "The Climate in Geneva"]

[Text] Geneva, October —The climate in these parts is not noted for its constancy, especially in the late fall. The climate prevailing at the Soviet-American Talks on Nuclear and Space Armaments, which have been going on here for several years now, is dependent on many components.

In any event, the diplomats and military experts taking part in the dialogue are well aware that the "main scene of action" is located far from the shores of Lake Geneva—in the capitals of the two states or the locales where Soviet-American meetings are held. The last occasion was in Wyoming, where Eduard Shevardnadze conversed with James Baker.

Nuclear and space arms were one of the key problems here, of course. Let us be frank: A shift did occur in this sphere. Given the compromise modifications the sides made to their stances, we can now speak of preparation for the signing of a treaty halving strategic offensive weapons as a reality.

These events have also determined the long-term "weather" forecast at the Geneva talks. At any rate, for the period of the 12th round, which got under way at the end of September.

"How are events developing there?" was the question I put to Soviet delegation chief Yu. Nazarkin on entering his office.

"The 12th round is far from being the range-finding meeting of its predecessor, which was, incidentally, the first under the Bush administration," he replied. "The basis of the talks is becoming firmer, and this is actually happening before your eyes. You would think that there is everything required for the work on the future agreement to be completed, particularly as the American side has responded positively to our ideas, proposals, and approaches to outstanding issues. However...."

Nazarkin was silent for a moment. The diplomat's many years of experience made him settle on a more prudent form of words:

"However, at present we merely have signs of forthcoming movement. We realize that time is needed to study and interpret the proposed innovations. The American side is putting various questions seeking to clarify our proposals—which is perfectly natural. The reports emanating from Washington of a keen contest of opinion being waged over our new approach toward problems of ABM systems and outer space, as refracted in correspondents' assessments, are alarming. I want to cite a recent article by Geoffrey Smith in THE NEW YORK TIMES. He acknowledges, in particular, that conservative circles of the U.S. military-industrial complex are seeking to question the innovativeness and significance of our approach, alleging that we have merely substituted a form of linkage between a strategic offensive arms treaty and the ABM treaty. These claims have, of course, nothing to do with reality. Our side has taken major steps. This is not a concession to the American side but actually a new look at the difficulties existing at the talks."

The delegation chief's concerns are perfectly understandable. In actual fact the conceptual breakthrough in considering the interconnection between strategic offensive arms and defensive arms has been effected. We have ceased this seemingly endless dispute and told our partner that we are ready to sign and ratify a treaty on strategic offensive arms even if no accord on the ABM problem has been reached by the time the treaty is finalized. However, the dispute was brought to an end on a fundamental condition: The ABM Treaty should be observed by both sides in the form signed in 1972. The path to an agreement on halving strategic offensive arms has been opened. But days slip by in Geneva and the U.S. delegation is still not ready to conduct work in a practical vein.

"I appreciate," Yu. Nazarkin said here, "that it is necessary to show a certain restraint and patience here. I can see that time is needed to translate the common positive mood that predominated in Wyoming into the 'language of negotiation.' This, objectively, constitutes the specific nature of the initial stage of the present round."

For the time being, however, the Soviet delegation is continuing to explain the main thrust and nuances of its new approach to its partner. It has put forward proposals aimed at agreeing on a uniform interpretation of the activity banned and permitted under the ABM Treaty. These incorporate ideas previously expressed on this score by the American side in Geneva. Under our proposals research and related tests could be conducted in outer space, but tests of ABM systems and components and their space-based prototypes would be banned.

Work in the sphere of strategic offensive arms shows no signs of abating either. The sides are discussing the possibility of limiting long-range air- and sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles with appropriate verification, as well as heavy bombers.

Looking ahead, as it were, both countries' diplomats and military experts are continuing to prepare this fall texts of a treaty on strategic offensive arms and relevant documents. Our delegation has placed on the negotiating table proposals relating, in particular, to the procedure for limiting mobile ICBMs. Trial verification and stability measures are being worked on which could be implemented before the conclusion of the treaty on strategic offensive armaments.

A large amount of work lies ahead—work that is in many respects routine and painstaking but which is essential if progress is to be made at the Geneva talks—before the political barometer points steadily to "clear weather."

United Nations Resumes Chemical Weapons Talks

TASS Announces Opening

LD3110085289 Moscow TASS in English 0822 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 31 TASS—A regular, 13th, round of Soviet-American consultations on a ban on chemical weapons has begun here.

A programme for this round of consultations was drawn up at the first meeting of experts on Monday.

By mutual agreement, matters concerning the implementation of the memorandum of understanding between the Soviet Union and the United States will be considered. The memorandum considers a bilateral experiment on the verification and exchange of date connected with a ban on chemical weapons.

The memorandum was signed by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Wyoming on September 23, this year.

Matters pertaining to the preparation of an international convention on the total elimination of chemical weapons are also expected to be discussed.

This round of consultations is expected to put into action the impetus given to efforts towards banning chemical weapons at the Wyoming meeting, Sergey Batsanov, leader of the Soviet delegation said.

Batsanov on Strengthening Security

LD3110075489 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 31 TASS—A search for ways to further strengthen international security and reduce arms, primarily on the European continent, and an acceleration of the talks on a ban on chemical weapons were the principal topics in Monday's [30 October] speech by Sergey Batsanov, Soviet representative at the Geneva conference on disarmament.

He spoke in the general debate in the United Nations General Assembly's first committee (political, security and disarmament).

Touching upon the problems of security in Europe, the Soviet representative drew the delegates' attention to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to Finland.

Speaking of the results of the visit he pointed to the importance of the Soviet-Finnish declaration that was signed during the visit.

The Soviet Union greatly appreciates Finland's call for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe. The initiative has also been supported by other countries.

Batsanov recalled that the Soviet Union's decision concerning its nuclear weapons in the Baltic Sea area was announced during the visit. The Soviet Union will unilaterally begin to eliminate certain categories of sea-launched weapons.

The talks about a ban on chemical weapons, the Soviet delegate said, are now in their most important stage. The drafting of a convention banning chemical weapons already goes beyond a purely speculative framework.

We believe that the convention should be concluded with the next year or two. We hope that the General Assembly will call for concluding the document at the earliest possible date, Batsanov said.

Chervov Says More Military Cuts 'Possible'

LD3010114189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1103 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct (TASS)—Colonel General Nikolay Chervov head of a department of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, has said that in conditions of reaching accords at the Vienna talks further reductions of Soviet troops in the northwest of the USSR are possible. He gave an interview to TASS diplomatic correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy in connection with the new peace initiatives set out by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in Finland. The general stressed that new steps to cut Soviet troops in the northwest of the country will now depend entirely on steps taken in response by the United States and NATO.

According to Chervov, in spite of some positive points in the talks being held in Vienna on conventional weapon reductions, the Soviet side cannot fail to be concerned by the lack of prospects for the total elimination of nuclear weapons in the region and the processes that have emerged as a brake on the cause of disarmament. This is primarily reflected in the NATO countries' reluctance to include naval forces in the talks or to extend confidence-building measures to the naval activities of the countries in the two blocs, particularly in the Atlantic, Norwegian, and Baltic Seas.

Nikolay Chervov pointed out that no small role is played here by the policies of Norway's leadership, which is terrified of a "threat" from the Soviet Union and continues to rely on NATO's Armed Forces to "defend" its territory in spite of considerable positive trends in reducing and eliminating military confrontation in Europe and the world as a whole. The general said that "at the present time this can only cause surprise".

Chervov believes that such a position on the part of this northern neighbor must be taken into account in examining the security of the Soviet border in the polar region and in making a decision about further reductions of armed forces and weapons in the northwest of the country.

More on Pact Foreign Ministers Meeting

Aboymov Discusses Meeting

LD2710211189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 27 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with I.P. Aboymov, USSR deputy foreign minister, by unidentified correspondent "on the eve" of the 26-27 October Warsaw Pact foreign ministers meeting in Warsaw—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] For the first time, the ministers of external economic contacts are taking part in the work of this organ of the Warsaw Treaty. Why is this? Is the CEMA perhaps not coping with its tasks?

[Aboymov] The reason is not that the CEMA is not equal to its duties, but rather that questions of economic cooperation are at present among the most topical issues of European cooperation, and naturally the foreign ministers have also decided to give these matters appropriate attention.

[Correspondent] Will some organ be set up, similar to your Committee of Foreign Ministers, or not?

[Aboymov] No. It is not envisaged that any sort of organizational organ will be set up in this sphere. This is rather an exchange of opinions on the political vision of the problems of European economic cooperation, especially on the eve of the general European forum on these questions which will be held in Bonn next year.

Economic Discussion

LD2810153189 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 28 Oct 89

[Text] Warsaw October 28 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valentin Volkov:

The Warsaw states' government members who are in charge of foreign trade and economic cooperation had a meeting here on Friday. Previously they had attended a session of the Foreign Ministers' Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member-states.

According to a press spokesman for the Polish minister of foreign economic cooperation, there was an exchange of opinions on ways to change the existing pattern of trade between the countries with due account of prices, the role of currency, and settlement procedures from the viewpoint of bringing them closer to general conditions of international trade.

The participants discussed changes of the mechanisms for the economic functioning of individual countries, consequences of that for economic cooperation with foreign countries as well as actions being taken in individual countries to adapt enterprises to the new situation.

The consequences of the formation of a single EEC market in 1992 for the access of commodities and services to it, particularly in the conditions of keen competition, and new requirements in the field of norms and standards, customs and administrative procedures, and the existing tariff and non-tariff barriers were also touched upon.

Joint Pact Policies

LD3010230189 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—The Soviet Union Gives priority attention to relations with Warsaw Treaty countries. A Soviet deputy foreign minister told journalists at a briefing held in the Soviet Foreign Ministry press-centre today.

Ivan Aboymov was commenting on the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Foreign Ministers' Committee, held in Warsaw on October 26-27.

He said the fact that the meeting was attended by ministers of foreign trade and of foreign economic relations of the allied countries "should be considered as the continuation of the Warsaw Treaty's politisation and gradual transformation into a political- and-military alliance."

During the meeting, the ministers not only reiterated their desire to pursue a joint policy on disarmament and security, but also demonstrated their serious intention to deepen economic, scientific and technical cooperation in Europe, Aboimov said.

He described the meeting's decision to take joint steps to add impetus to the Vienna talks and the ministers' determination to seek agreement on considerable reductions in armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe as early as next year, as an "important result."

Speaking about the reforms in a number of Warsaw Treaty countries, Aboimov said: "Whether or not reforms take place in allied and friendly countries, the latter do not cease to be so for us.

"The Warsaw meeting showed once again that all allies are going to stick to mutual commitments. All of them displayed the political will to continue to develop the multifaceted and equitable cooperation of allied countries, constantly improving the mechanism of collective interaction."

The Soviet deputy foreign minister said "We don't regard the existence of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO as permanent factors of the future.

"Favouring their simultaneous disbandment in the long run, we think this can take place as we proceed on disarmament, confidence-building and the development of cooperation in europe."

TASS Reports Perfilyev News Briefing 30 Oct

Nicaragua Situation

LD3010154489 Moscow TASS in English 1513 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—"The Nicaraguan Government has many times announced its intention to fulfil the commitments it took under an agreement reached by Central American presidents in Tela. There is enough proof that Nicaragua has been strictly observing its provisions," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told journalists here today.

The Soviet spokesman was commenting on President Ortega's statement on the possible resumption of hostilities against the Contras by the Sandinista People's Army.

The Nicaraguan Government has every right to expect progress in implementing the other part of the Tela agreement on disbanding the armed opposition and it is concerned about the absence of any tangible progress here either, Perfilyev said.

The situation is being aggravated by the fact, that despite the unilateral ceasefire by the Sandinista People's Army, the Contras have not stopped military hostilities and have even stepped them up recently. This makes it difficult to hold normal elections in Nicaragua and forces the Nicaraguan Government to take retaliatory measures against the Contras.

All this can aggravate not only the preparation for elections in Nicaragua, but also the entire process of Central American settlement, Perfilyev said.

Latest COCOM Session

LD3010164189 Moscow TASS in English 1617 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—West European businessmen are increasingly exasperated by the continuing activity of the COCOM committee controlling exports to socialist countries, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev said today, describing COCOM as a "Cold War" relic.

He told a briefing here he could understand the irritation of the businessmen over missed profits, which are especially large considering the requirements of the markets of the Soviet union and some other countries in the process of modernising their economies.

Commenting on the latest COCOM session, Perfilyev said it demonstrated once again that the United States and some of its closer European partners remain the most conservative force in COCOM.

He blamed their pressure for the absence of any easing of multilateral controls of exports to socialist countries. Perfilyev said that those who suspect the measures are designed to protect U.S. positions in some industries from West Europeans are perhaps correct, especially as America is not living through the best of times on world markets.

Concern for its security and protection of its strategic interests are the right of every nation but this hardly presupposes the right to virtually completely block high-tech trade between East and West, the Soviet spokesman said.

He voiced regret at the fact that the participants in the latest COCOM session marched out of step with the times and did not contribute with their decisions to promoting greater trust and broader cooperation between East and West.

Loncar Visit

LD3010170289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct (TASS)—Vadim Perfilyev, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, reported at a briefing here today that Budimir Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of the SFRY, is arriving here today on a 5-day official visit at the invitation of the Soviet government. This visit, he added, continues the Soviet-Yugoslav political dialogue which has been developing with particular dynamism since Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Yugoslavia in March, 1988.

The Foreign Ministry representative said that in addition to talks with Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, Budomir Loncar will be received by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The talks will center on political and economic matters of bilateral relations, and the sides are also to discuss international problems, including the issues of disarmament, the situation in Europe, the development of the East-West and North-South dialogue, including the results of the Belgrade conference of the heads of state and government of the nonaligned countries. The signing of a cultural cooperation program for 1989-91, and an agreement on reciprocal trips by USSR and SFRY citizens is planned within the framework of the visit.

In the opinion of the Soviet side, Vadim Perfilyev said in conclusion, Budimir Loncar's visit to the USSR will serve the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the two countries.

Summary of Briefing

LD3010200389 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—The Soviet Union gives priority attention to relations with Warsaw Treaty countries, a Soviet deputy foreign minister told journalists at a briefing held in the Soviet Foreign Ministry Press-Centre today.

Ivan Aboymov was commenting on the meeting of the Warsaw Treaty Foreign Ministers' Committee, held in Warsaw on October 26-27.

"The Warsaw meeting showed once again that all allies are going to stick to mutual commitments. All of them displayed the political will to continue to develop the multifaceted and equitable cooperation of allied countries, constantly improving the mechanism of collective interaction."

Yugoslav Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Budimir Loncar is arriving in Moscow today for a five-day official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told the briefing.

Perfilyev said that Loncar would meet Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and is expected to be received by Gorbachev.

Loncar's visit will continue to promote friendship and cooperation between the two countries, Perfilyev said.

Perfilyev also spoke about Soviet-Japanese consultations on ensuring safety at seas held in Moscow on October 25-26. He said that the sides discussed ways of establishing a search and rescue system in the Sea of Japan, the Sea of Okhotsk and the northwestern part of the Pacific Ocean.

They also discussed further development of cooperation between Soviet and Japanese search-and-rescue services.

"The Nicaraguan Government has many times announced its intention to fulfil the commitments it took under an agreement reached by Central American presidents in Tela. There is enough proof that Nicaragua has been strictly observing its provisions," Perfilyev told journalists.

The Soviet spokesman was commenting on President Ortega's statement on the possible resumption of hostilities against the contras by the Sandinista People's Army.

The Nicaraguan Government has every right to expect progress in implementing the other part of the Tela Agreement on disbanding the armed opposition and it is concerned about the absence of any tangible progress here either, Perfilyev said.

The situation is being aggravated by the fact, that despite the unilateral ceasefire by the Sandinista People's Army, the contras have not stopped military hostilities and have even stepped them up recently. This makes it difficult to hold normal elections in Nicaragua and forces the Nicaraguan Government to take retaliatory measures against the contras.

Panel Focuses on Gorbachev Visit to Finland

LD2810232189 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 27 Oct 89

["Top Priority" program, presented by host Pavel Kuznetsov, with Radomir Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute, and (Andrey Korchunov), not further identified]

[Text] [Kuznetsov] How do you do, ladies and gentlemen. I am Pavel Kuznetsov, presenting "Top Priority," with Radomir Bogdanov and (Andrey Korchunov). The major event of the week as we're taping the show is Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Finland. Being a small country, Finland stands as a towering example of economic success and also since 1948 we've described our ties with Finland as a model for East-West relations. So the visit has two clear sides, or aspects, to it, a purely economic one and a military-political one. So let's skip the first, the economic aspect, and turn to the latter one which I think goes far beyond the narrow framework of our bilateral relations with Finland.

My first questions is this. What is the most salient feature of Mikhail Gorbachev's trip to Finland? Is it a joint declaration with Finland on principles which advocate absolute respect for the internal affairs of other countries, or is it his call to turn the Baltic Sea into a nuclear-free zone, or perhaps there are some other aspects to, and angles to his trip that you would like to pick up as being very important?

[Bogdanov] Pavel, all that is of course very important, but I have another view on that. First of all, this is a very small, tiny country and a huge Soviet Union. And our leader, who is terribly busy with all domestic problems, finds out the time to go to pay a visit to this small neighbouring friendly country. Because Finland is becoming a very important model of our relations with the, our neighbouring belt, if you like.

[Kuznetsov] I heard experts say, excuse me, that Finland is Europe's Japan, because its economic growth exceeds anything, anything that...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] That's number one, but I'm not, this is not my cup of tea, economics, though I believe in economics, but what, what really excites me...

[Kuznetsov interrupting] When you say you believe in economics, in economy, you, you would like to see more goods on consumer shelves, that, that's...

[Bogdanov, interupting] Yes, that's my, that's my interest in economy. This is very layman's interest, but in this particular case you remember this term, "Finlandization" which is, always was for me not a shame but very beautiful word [word indistinct, interruptions] meaning of the real, real...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] Some people find it offensive and something derogatory...

[Bogdanov] No, no, it's not, for me that was not, I wrote a lot about that, that Finlandization, by the way, several years ago that Finland, what they call Finlandization, this is exactly a real, a real model of real and very pragmatic and very interesting model of relations beween big and small countries, and that to my mind applies fully to the new thinking. But Gorbachev, I believe, went to Finland (?to try), found the time, just to demonstrate to everybody, including our neighbors, like for instance Poland, like Hungary, like some other neighbors, that, look, I'm a great, representing a great country. I'm going there as absolutely equal partner, equal partner, without the slightest doubt that we are big and you are small, with all due respect. And I respect them so much that I leave my country in a very crucial moment and I go for 2 days over there. I believe this is a statement, this is very significant. And if you look at the papers signed over there and if you correlate those papers to the Baltic region, to the northern region, I would say to the northern region, because Finland plays more and more significant role in the whole northern region, you will see the real importance of the, the, visit. You have proof of the visit. it is not only a very importnat political declaration by itself...

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, Radomir Bogdanov; let's look into the military-political aspect of Mikhail Gorbachev's trip. He announced, for example, that the Soviet Union had withdrawn two aging nuclear subs from the Baltic Sea and is going to do the same with the four remaining subs of this class. He also said that the Soviet Union had no medium- or shorter-range weapons in the vicinity, that is, it has moved them to sites beyond range of northern Europe, which is important in terms of security for the northern flank of NATO, I think.

But the reaction to his statement was rather cool, for a number of reasons. Let me go through some of those reasons. First of all, the United States said it does not believe in nuclear-free zones because it reserves the right to resort to nuclear weapons in case of a surprise conventional attack by superior forces from the Soviet Union. Another reason is that the Soviet Union can reach NATO countries with longer-range weapons which it still has in its arsenal, and then Great Britain and the United States are very sensitive and even reluctant to discuss naval forces, whenever we bring this issue up, because they think they see those forces as the lifeblood of NATO's defense posture.

At the same time, some experts said that the Soviet Union has opened a new peace drive by calling for a nuclear-free Baltic Sea and it's going to perhaps at some time in the future, to do the same with regard to the Mediterranean Sea. Now how do you, what is your feeling about this, er, reaction about the significance of the Soviet move? Is it really a hollow statement?

[(Korchunov]) Well, first of all, I think that any unilateral step taken by the Soviet Union in the field of disarmament is important. One can argue that these subs are obsolete, that they're just you know, old trash, but still they carry nuclear weapons.

[Kuznetsov] Jean La Rocque, a retired admiral of the United States, said they were old dogs, worth nothing...

[(Korchunov]) Well, probably, probably just because they were old dogs they were even more dangerous than new types of submarines, just more dangerous in case there is some accident or, you know, some malfunction. We, we saw a lot of such things in this year, so I think it is important. They my guess is that, to believe that, you know, the United States will applaud and accept the whole idea of a nuclear-free zone in the Baltic...

[Kuznetsov] Is it again propaganda?

[(Korchunov)] No, I think that this step is directed primarily on north, northern European continent including NATO members, NATO members Norway and Denmark. I think that the idea is to strengthen their traditional nuclear policy which is not to allow nuclear weapons on their territory, and I would say that there is some tendency of, to, well, of erosion of this principle in recent years. So I think that the unilateral steps of Gorbachev and his declaration may be important to stop this erosion.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, I would agree with you that Gorbachev is really clever and smart, but he's also serious, and when this proposal, this call, appeal, to turn the Baltic Sea into a nuclear-free zone is being criticized or brushed away, those people don't look into what he said carefully enough, because he said the Soviet Union's Armed Forces in that region would be restructured, er, within next year in such a way that it would pose no threat to...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] This is, this is very important point, because the main, main, main contradiction if you like, main line of argument against his, at his denuclearization proposal is a surprise attack. Now if you tell our, this public opinion or if you tell our American or European listeners that, look, in a year you will have purely defensive army not capable to strike. So what, what will be left then from this kind of argument? That's number one. Number two. Whatever you may say, I quite agree with Andrey—though they are, whether they are old dogs or they are new sharks they are carrying nuclear weapons and they have nuclear engines and they are contaminating one way or the other the Baltic Sea, and this is if you look at that from the ecological point of view, that's very [words indistinct].

[Kuznetsov] Yeah, let's take a look at a recent speech by our Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze before the Supreme Soviet or our standing legislators, legislature. It received a very positive response from the West, especially in those parts, those parts of the speech which dealt with the Krasnoyarsk radar station which we admitted was a major violation of the ABM Treaty of 1972, and the other part of his speech was dealt with our involvement in Afghanistan. Now, my question is this concerning this speech. Was it a bit of education, was it an attempt to introduce our legislators to some basics of foreign policy, or do you share the view that it was some sort of a preemptive action to, perhaps, to avoid a tough and possibly embarassing criticism of our foreign policy by law makers because we know that they are discussing, they are busy discussing the acute economic issues, but they are not as well informed perhaps about foreign policy overall, I mean, as they should be. What is your view?

[(Korchunov)] Well, you know, I think that, first of all, this speech was very polished and balanced. I think that Shevardnadze was very careful not to alienate deputies with conservative view point and also deputies with liberal viewpoint. That is why I think that everybody felt that perhaps there should be something more than he, than he disclosed. But still I think he, he won his game because you know he managed somehow to, well, to (?low) down the discussion on...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Andrey, I'm sorry to say but one should be fair to him. To my mind this is a new (?word) in the political, you know, in the political practice in the Soviet Union. His, his report—this is something very new.

[Kuznetsov] Do you remember this line when he said that he is going to retire if, if our foreign policy violates the principles of morality, ethics and a respect (?for them)?

[Bogdanov, interrupting] Do you agree with, do you agree with me that this, this piece of art of foreign policy was very much connected, linked to the domestic policy, and if you look carefully at his report you will find out very clearly some polemics and some answers to conservative and very important members of the, you know, of the establishment. That was, that was very interesting...

[(Korchunov), interrupting] Well, I would agree with you. But, you know, I think that probably he was too much preoccupied with domestic concerns, and he spoke about, you know, money, savings, about, you know, how it will affect domestic politics, but I think that what's, what's lacking in this report is some prospect for the Soviet overall foreign policy strategy; the problem of alliances, the problem of priorities. You know, he tried to cover almost everything and, you know, the picture is too complicated now to define the major goals of our foreign policy...[several speak at once]

[Kuznetsov] Gentlemen, gentlemen, gentlemen. We, let's make it a topic of our discussion sometime in the future. Let me go back to on the previous panel we discussed, ah, a statement, the statement by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker of 16th October in which he said the United States wants perestroyka to succeed. Since then, he made another major speech on arms control where he advocated bolder steps in reducing arms. He, the idea is that by reducing weapons the United States would make it more difficult and costly for future Soviet governments to reverse course. Then he is reported to have barred a speech by Robert Gates, a top expert on Soviet policy in the White House, because it was in his view too pessmestic about the prospects of perestroyka and Gorbachev himself. But at the same time, we know that the United States continues to resist efforts by its allies to lift at least some of the export and trade controls with the Soviet Union. So, can you give me an answer about whether the Bush administration is just involved in some kind of lip service, is trying to impress us, or perhaps it's just not prepard, not ready to pursue more aggressively some specific...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] I believe that Bush's administration faces three difficulties. One difficulty is inside difficulty—that I call inside difficulty...

[Kuznetsov] internal bickering?

[Bogdanov] Internal bickering among themselves: Different wings and differing assessments of the Soviet Union and Soviet policy. And you mentioned Gates, he is a very specific figure. He used to be deputy director of Central Intelligence Agency for so many years...

[Kuznetsov] So what?

[Bogdanov] ...and he considered to be a specialist. I'm afraid that his view of the Soviet Union is very traditional. I leave it on his conscience.

[Kuznetsov] It's very dim and gloomy and pessimistic.

[Bogdanov] Gloomy and pessimistic. Then you have a difference between different, I mean, different political wings, so that's number one difficulty. Number two difficulty—the administration is under criticism and pressure from the Democrats, so this is, ah, they have to satisfy them and, and the third difficulty is the Congress, Congress and they have to manouver and to balance their policy. But my view...

[(Korchunov)] [words indistinct] there is a fourth difficulty. (?areas) within the Soviet Union are so unstable that you know, the...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] So the answer is that the Bush administration is involved in a very careful balancing act?

[Bogdanov] Yeah, that's what I, what I...mean.

[Kuznetsov] Would you agree or does your opinion differ from that of Radomir Bogdanov?

[(Korchunov)] Well, I think that they are trying to be more balanced and they do not want to make, you know, ah, they...

[Kuznetsov] To (?speed) up the demise of perestroyka.

[(Korchunov)] Yeah, and they don't want to, you know, make their prophecy of inevitable failure of Gorbachev a self-fulfilling prophecy.

[Kuznetsov] Yeah. Let's turn to Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Finland to conclude our program, and this time let's touch briefly on the joint declaration which, as we already mentioned, advocates absolute respect for the internal affairs in other countries. We know that this is actually the last nail in the coffin of the Brezhnev Doctrine of so-called doctrine of limited sovereignty. Now, my question is this: Do the principles contained in that declaration apply to our domestic situation, because they seem to be meant to strengthen our claims to a law-based society that we are striving to build. Would you agree with this or is it something totally different from what we have here at home?

[Bogdanov] No, I believe this is not totally different.

[(Korchunov)] Well, I believe that the, you know, this idea of absolute noninterference is not feasible because we are interfering; because by our trade we are interfering, by our cultural relationships we are interfering, we can speak about noninterference in political sense and you know, as far...

[Kuznetsov, interrupting] This is what is meant because this is spelled out in the declaration.

[(Korchunov)] Yeah, but you know interdependence means interference, after all. So we are speaking about some, you know, purposeful political pressure, and from this point of view I think that there is a parallel between our domestic development and our foreign policy.

[Kuznetsov] Thank you, (Andrey Korchunov) thank you, Radomir Bogdanov for coming to our studio to share your views on this issue of "Top Priority." This is Pavel Kuznetsov, your host, signing off and we thank everybody and invite our listeners to tune in again a week from now on the same wavelength. Goodbye.

International Meeting Examines Nuclear Accidents

LD3010214589 Moscow TASS in English 2112 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Sochi October 30 TASS—By TASS special correspondent Veronika Romanenkova:

Analysis of all the aspects of the 1986 Chernobyl disaster and its implications is the task of the first working group on large accidents and their consequences. The group has begun its sessions here on Monday. Organised by the nuclear societies of the USSR and the USA, this international meeting is attended by around a hundred prominent foreign scientists.

For some years now the problems of nuclear power have been in the centre of world public attention. Until quite recently the advantages of nuclear power plants [NPP] (now they number 307 in the world), the efficiency and the practically inexhaustible fuel resources have been taken for granted. Construction of NPP's instead of hydro and thermal power stations has saved millions of hectares of arable land and reduced atmospheric pollution.

However, the three-mile island accident in the USA in 1979 and especially the Chernobyl tragedy in the USSR have sharply changed the public attitude to the NPP's. And specialists have been forced to revise some of the positions of principle which had until recently seemed unshakable.

"In the five days of work the international group intends to discuss NPP safety, the transfer of products of fission in environment, dosimetry, and effects on human health," Dr. Sc. (physics and mathematics) Leonid Bolshov from the nuclear society of the USSR said opening the conference.

"The venue for the meeting has not been selected accidentally", chairman of executive committee of the Sochi city council Sergey Derendyayev said. "It is for this reason that our city which is actively working for disarmament and nuclear security that the United Nations has given the status of a city—messenger of peace. The present meeting of scientists will not only be largely helpful in solving the safety problems of nuclear power but will also contribute to the cause of peace".

Adamishin Meets With UNESCO Head

PM2710152389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Strengthening Ties"]

[Text] Paris, 26 Oct—A meeting took place at the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization [UNESCO] headquarters between A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign minister and Soviet delegation head at the 25th session of this international organization's general conference, and Federico Mayor, UNESCO director general.

In the course of the conversation they discussed a number of specific questions relating to the activity of the organization linked with further boosting the effectiveness of its work.

The sides also discussed certain practical issues concerning the work of the 25th Session of the UNESCO General Conference and questions associated with the implementation of the accords secured during Federico Mayor's recent official visit to the USSR.

Petrovskiy Meets With IAEA Director Blix

LD2710182789 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 27 Oct 89

[Text] New York October 27 TASS—A meeting between Vladimir Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, and deputy chief delegate at the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly, and Hans Blix, general director of the International Atomic Agency (IAEA) was held here.

Increasing the IAEA's participation in the solution of global problems such as the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, the satisfaction of mankind's energy requirements, and improvement of the world ecological situation were discussed during the meeting.

Blix welcomed the Soviet programme to shut down all plutonium reactors by the year 2000 as an illustration of the Soviet Union's readiness to boost work to end the production of weapons-grade fissionable materials.

Petrovskiy also had a meeting with U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar. They discussed practical matters concerning the refinement of the U.N. mechanism.

United States & Canada

Primakov, Delegation Hold Talks During U.S Visit

Meeting With Bush, Congress

*PM3110120589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "Positive Development"]

[Text] Washington, 27 Oct—Ye.M. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, and head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation currently visiting the United States, has been received by U.S. President G. Bush in the White House. In the course of their conversation, which lasted more than half an hour, according to a statement to Soviet and U.S. journalists by the head of the Soviet delegation, questions of Soviet-U.S. relations were touched upon and the importance of expanding interparliamentary contacts between the USSR and the United States was noted. "The conversation was good and meaningful," Ye.M. Primakov commented. "The President particularly stressed the importance of the upcoming summit to be held between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in the coming year."

"We asked the President why there was such a long hiatus in Soviet-U.S. dialogue following his election," USSR Supreme Soviet Members A.A. Sobchak and I.O. Bisher told me in conversation. "The President explained that it took time to take over from the previous administration, carry out a 'strategic review' of U.S. foreign policy, and, finally, prepare U.S. public opinion for further steps in the development of relations between our countries."

Questions of expanding ties between the two countries' parliaments were touched upon during talks between the Soviet lawmakers and their U.S. colleagues at the U.S. Congress. Soviet delegation member A.V. Yablokov proposed, for example, that permanent working contacts be established between the USSR Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress committees on environmental protection and scientific and technical cooperation. G. Mitchell, Democratic leader of the Senate, described this as a very promising idea.

U.S. lawmakers inquired in conversation with Supreme Soviet members whether perestroyka in the Soviet Union is "irreversible," to what extent it is "bound up" with specific personalities, and whether there might not be a reversal of the current course in the Soviet Union's domestic and foreign policy. These are no idle questions, and their elucidation by Soviet lawmakers largely determines a correct understanding of the prospects for the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Ye.M. Primakov also had a long conversation with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. Both sides expressed the desire to fill Soviet-U.S. relations with new content, and the question of the normalization of trade and economic relations between the two countries was touched upon especially.

An evening reception at the National Gallery of Art was attended by U.S. Congress leaders G. Mitchell and R. Dole, U.S. Chief Justice W. Rehnquist, leading politicians from both parties, prominent U.S. public figures, and Yu.V. Dubinin, Soviet ambassador to the United States.

More on Primakov's Activities

*PM3110121389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
29 Oct 89 First Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "Visit Continues"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Oct—The third day of the official visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, began with a visit to the Brookings Institution in Washington. This very prestigious scientific center analyzes central problems of the world economy and international relations and devotes special attention to studying problems of U.S.-Soviet relations.

Addressing a large group of institution staffers and experts in U.S.-Soviet relations, the Supreme Soviet delegation head spoke in detail about the activity of the Soviet parliament, the progress of perestroyka, and the processes of renewal, democratization, and glasnost taking place in Soviet society.

"It is more than 4 and ½ years since the last U.S. visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation," Ye.M. Primakov pointed out. "During these years there have been cardinal changes both in our country and throughout the world." Speaking in detail about the lawmaking activity of Soviet parliamentarians, he pointed out, in particular, that the USSR Supreme Soviet is beginning to tackle foreign policy questions in real earnest.

After the end of the meeting at the Brookings Institution the Soviet delegation had a meeting with a group of senators at the U.S. Congress. They included such well-known and influential legislators as Alan Cranston, Claiborne Pell, Sam Nunn, Robert Dole, and George Mitchell. "I compare the previous visit by a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation, when we engaged in mutual exposure of each other's shortcomings, with what is happening now," Senator Cranston, in particular, pointed out. "Here is clear evidence of glasnost and perestroyka."

The sides pointed to the importance of expanding interparliamentary ties between the USSR and the United States. They also pointed to the need for cooperation between Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians both in resolving the global problems of our time—nuclear disarmament, above all—and in the sphere of normalizing and improving Soviet-U.S. relations in the interests of the two countries' peoples.

At a news conference held in the Capitol building the same day G. Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, declared: "We have had exceptionally fruitful meetings with our Soviet guests. In the course of the 2-day meetings we discussed a whole package of items on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations, including the problems of arms control, the perestroyka being implemented in the USSR, and the U.S. positions on questions of developing trade and economic ties with the Soviet Union. The discussions took place in an atmosphere of openness, glasnost, and frankness and were exceptionally fruitful."

"We have gotten to know each other better and have become good friends," R. Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate, emphasized.

"Relations between our two countries have entered a qualitatively new stage," Ye.M. Primakov pointed out in his speech. "The two sides have reached agreement that this has happened primarily thanks to perestroyka in the Soviet Union. Note must also be taken of the development of realistic trends in U.S. foreign policy, which has enabled us to enter the new stage of proceeding from mutual understanding to cooperation."

Asked by TASS correspondents about the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting due next year, the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation head said, in particular: "I believe that it will be an event of tremendous importance. We hope that as a result of this meeting considerable progress will be made on the path of improving Soviet-U.S. relations. Intensive preparations are now being made for the summit meeting, which will undoubtedly mark the commencement of a new phase of bilateral relations by the USSR and the United States."

In conclusion the Soviet delegation head advocated strengthening interparliamentary contacts with U.S. colleagues, voicing the hope that the new meetings in Moscow with members of the U.S. Congress will be productive and useful.

In the afternoon Ye.M. Primakov and the group of USSR people's deputies met with T. Foley, speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and conducted a broad exchange of opinions with him on questions of the further development of bilateral relations and interparliamentary contacts. Yu.V. Dubinin, USSR ambassador to the United States, participated in the meetings.

Senate Leaders, Primakov Comment

PM3110123989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Linnik dispatch: "Communique Signed"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Oct—The Washington leg of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's U.S. visit ended—for the first time in the entire practice of Soviet-U.S. interparliamentary contacts—with the signing of a joint communique.

The communique outlines the range of questions discussed by the Soviet legislators with the leaders of the Senate, with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and with the Senate group for observing arms reduction talks. The range is very extensive: disarmament topics, Soviet-U.S. trade and economic ties, foreign aid, problems of the environment, the fight against international terrorism and the drugs trade.

The U.S. legislators were concerned, above all, about questions connected with the progress of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, about problems of national relations, and about the proposed legislative changes to the USSR's emigration policy. The Supreme Soviet members urged their colleagues to remove the obstacles in the way of normalizing Soviet-U.S. trade. Naturally, what was meant by these obstacles was the Jackson-Vannik amendment.

On what did the two countries' legislators agree? I cite directly from the communique: "Arms control remains an important and promising area in Soviet-U.S. relations... Support for efforts to eliminate obstacles in the way of expanding economic cooperation... Working contacts between the two countries' parliamentarians contribute to the establishment of closer Soviet-U.S. cooperation..."

"What are your impressions of the new Supreme Soviet?" I asked G. Mitchell and R. Dole, leaders of the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate, at a news conference.

"I must point to the extraordinary openness and directness with which the Soviet delegation members spoke. Our meetings and talks made a great impression on me," G. Mitchell said. "I would also point to the Soviet delegation's high qualitative standard. Differences between us remain. But the first step toward solving a problem is to define it."

"I can only add that previously the Soviet delegation spoke with one voice, while the others nodded in agreement," Senator R. Dole added to that. "Now you, too, have different views. I believe that this is a step forward. We impatiently await further exchanges of opinions with USSR Supreme Soviet members."

"The meetings in Washington—both with the President and the secretary of state and with our colleagues in the U.S. Senate—have made a great impression on us," Ye.M. Primakov, head of the Soviet delegation, summed up his opinion of the discussions. "Our visit began with a bang, I would say. Our talks have confirmed that relations between our countries are at a new stage. We believe that this is a result of perestroyka, which is influencing the whole system of international relations.

Of course, we would not want to belittle the advance in U.S. positions, too, on problems of our relationship."

Well, the meeting of Soviet and U.S. legislators turned out to be really full and useful—in short, one which demands a sequel. Therefore the leaders of the U.S. Senate gratefully accepted the USSR Supreme Soviet's invitation to pay a return visit to the Soviet Union.

Today the two countries' legislators can play an important role in creating constructive relations between our countries. The Soviet parliamentarians' current U.S. visit confirms this.

The Supreme Soviet members are to continue on their way to the states of Maine, Kansas, California, and New York.

Congressmen Interviewed

LD3010122689 Moscow TASS in English 1106 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Washington October 30 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash:

The official visit to the United States by the Soviet Parliamentary delegation led by Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union, has aroused much interest here and is being widely discussed in U.S. Congress.

The new Soviet Parliament has transformed political life in the Soviet Union, George Mitchell, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, told TASS.

This change was evident in the analytical discussions and critical attitudes of the USSR people's deputies whom we met, he said.

I think these were constructive meetings which will serve to strengthen friendly, good relations between two great countries and peoples. There is no doubt that the Soviet deputies' visit will contribute to the cause of universal peace, he said.

The mission of American and Soviet parliamentarians is to serve their peoples, said Robert Dole, leader of the Republican minority in the Senate.

In this sense we are gratified to see changes taking place in the Soviet Union. In the final analysis, our job is to promote greater mutual trust and understanding between nations and primarily between the American and Soviet peoples, he said.

The lofty efforts which your legislators make back at home cannot but give rise to admiration. One should also note the positive role of the two countries' leaders, President George Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev, who are thoughtfully developing the realistic tendencies that have appeared in American-Soviet relations of late, Dole told TASS.

The Soviet delegation's visit is taking place in a fine atmosphere, said Alan Cranston, deputy leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate. This has become possible primarily due to the significant changes being effected by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Democratisation, the affirmation of the influential role of the U.S. congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and finally the removal of the threat of nuclear war are of vital importance to both the United States and the Soviet Union, he said.

It is also of vital importance that our states should have normal, predictable relations that would serve as a guarantee of the prevention of nuclear disaster, Cranston said.

The visit by a delegation of the revitalized Soviet Parliament is exceptionally useful, Claiborne Pell, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told TASS.

In an atmosphere of mutual understanding we discussed some key issues of world politics and endorsed the success of Soviet-American and multilateral talks on disarmament. The two sides also came out in favour of broader economic contacts between the two countries, he said.

During the meetings with the Soviet deputies we discussed a wide range of matters concerning arms control in detail, said Sam Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

There is a consensus that it is essential to seek progress at the talks on nuclear and conventional arms, keeping uppermost the need for strict verification. Arms control remains an important and promising aspect of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, he said.

I am against a confrontational style in general and in our relationships with the Soviet Union, in particular, said Thomas Foley, speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Common sense suggests something else: To show greater flexibility and build relations between the two countries on the basis of trust and mutual respect, he said.

Yazov Interviewed, Discusses Recent U.S. Visit

AU2710163589 Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 26 Oct p 4

["Interview with Army General Dimitriy Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and minister of defense of the USSR, with NOVOSTI correspondent Valeriy Pogrebenkov, especially for NARODNA ARMIYA: 'The First Wave of the Landing'"; date and place not given]

[Text] [Pogrebenkov] Dimitriy Timofeyevich, what is the significance of your visit to the United States in the context of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations?

[Yazov] The Soviet delegation's visit represented a further step toward consolidating trust and mutual understanding in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. The importance of this step is determined by the fact that it is taking place in the military field and reinforces the positive changes that have emerged in this area in recent years. These changes are clearly directly linked with the general improvement in the world's political climate and the dynamic development of the Soviet-American dialogue at the top level.

I must say that during our U.S. visit, in the course of our meetings and talks with the leaders of the U.S. Administration, Department of Defense, and Armed Forces, we were constantly aware of two factors: first, the results of the talks between Shevardnadze and Baker that took place prior to our arrival, and second, the meeting between Gorbachev and Bush due to take place in the first half of next year. From this viewpoint, too, the visit of the Soviet military delegation provided a kind of additional catalyst for further enhancing the steady, dynamic development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Pogrebenkov] What impression did Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney make on you?

[Yazov] During my 5-day stay in the United States I had the opportunity to meet the U.S. secretary of defense in different situations: during the lengthy plenary sessions of the delegations, during our journey together to the Gettysburg National Park, and at protocol functions. Of course, the length of time we were able to spend in one another's company was not so extensive, but it seems to me that this lack of time was more than compensated for by the intensity and subject matter of our talks and the attempt of both sides to understand one another. This is why I formed a decided impression of Richard Cheney as a highly competent man who does not waste his words, a man who is decisive, firm, but at the same time able to carefully listen to the reasoned views of his interlocutor and to unerringly react to changes in the situation. In a word, it seems to me that he possesses all the qualities essential for a political and state leader of so high a rank.

[Pogrebenkov] Could you tell us about the most interesting episode in your visits to military installations in the United States?

[Yazov] We visited a number of such installations—North Island U.S. Navy Base in San Diego, on the shore of the Pacific in California; Luke U.S. Air Force Base in Arizona; and Paul Air Force Base in the State of North Carolina. There were many interesting episodes, but the most interesting one was connected with the amphibious landing carried out during the U.S. Marines' maneuvers at Camp Pendleton, near San Diego.

The Soviet military delegation was flown out by helicopter to the general-purpose amphibious assault ship "Belleau Wood," which was out in the ocean. After touring the ship, the Soviet generals and officers were taken on board one of the hovercraft carried by the Belleau Wood, which was then lowered into the sea and sped toward the shore, into the exercise area. When the amphibious craft came out of the water onto dry land, the members of the Soviet delegation were the first to step on shore. We were met by Lieutenant General Monaghan, the commander of the exercise. In greeting him, I duly reported: "First wave of landing, consisting of Soviet military delegation, present and correct, Sir!"

The U.S. general, as well as all those around him, appreciated the joke. They also appreciated the deep meaning contained in the very fact of the participation of Soviet servicemen in a small part of an amphibious landing operation carried out by the U.S. Navy. This fact reflected the very essence of the powerful demand of the times. Cooperation instead of opposition; trust in place of confrontation; mutual understanding instead of hostility—these are what the Soviet and American peoples and the whole of mankind need today.

[Pogrebenkov] What are the prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. military contacts in the nineties?

[Yazov] We have gathered quite a lot of experience of such contacts. In Bern in 1988 I met for the first time with former U.S. Secretary of Defense Carlucci. Later I had another meeting in Moscow with him and with Admiral Crowe, the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces. Meetings between the chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the U.S. Armed Forces were set on a regular basis, as well as meetings between leaders of the two countries' armed services, meetings of military experts, mutual visits by parliamentary committees dealing with the armed forces, exchanges involving delegations from institutes of higher military education, military medical men, and historians, visits by naval vessels, and other contacts. The plan we jointly drew up for such contacts during the 1988-89 period is being successfully completed.

The agreement signed in September this year for preventing dangerous military activity is of fundamental importance, as is the agreement reached on the notification of large-scale maneuvers of the strategic forces.

It may be stated without exaggeration that the contacts between the USSR and the United States in the military field now have a good foundation. This foundation must be strengthened and developed. The agreement in principle on the joint preparation of a new draft plan for military contacts in future years that was reached during the Soviet military delegation's visit to the United States will help to achieve this. We expect that this plan will be approved during the visit of the U.S. secretary of defense to the Soviet Union envisaged for next year, the invitation for which I handed over to Richard Cheney.

Military contacts constitute an important component of Soviet-U.S. relations. Strengthening and developing them by all means available is in accord with the fundamental interests of the Soviet and American peoples and with the aspiration to build a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

China

Jiang Says PRC Opposed to Exporting Revolution

PM3110101789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "China Is Fundamentally Opposed"]

[Text] Beijing, 26 Oct—China is fundamentally opposed to the "export of revolution" to other countries and at the same time will not brook interference in its own internal affairs and in the process of socialist building, Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, said here at a meeting with Thai Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan.

The question of the choice of social system, the CPC leader pointed out, is determined by the people of each individual state. As for external ties, they must always develop on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. China will not change its policy of reforms and openness.

Dwelling on the Cambodian question, Jiang Zemin stated the need for the "obvious and complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops" along with the creation of a quadripartite coalition government headed by Prince Sihanouk.

Chatchai Chunhawan described Thai-Chinese relations as "very good," stressing their characteristic "extremely high level of mutual understanding." Touching on the subject of Cambodia, the Thai prime minister stressed the question of creating an international supervisory mechanism making it possible to confirm Vietnam's avowed complete troop withdrawal from Cambodia.

PRAVDA Views Developing USSR-PRC Ties

PM3110095089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[K. Vnukov article: "Living Tissue: Soviet-Chinese Relations Today"]

[Text] Back in the early 70's an experienced Chinese Sovietologist, in conversation with the author of these lines, comparing USSR-PRC relations to a silken fabric, said with concern that the threads that bind us can be broken quite easily, but restoring them would take years and colossal efforts. The subsequent course of events showed how difficult it was to grasp what is today a self-evident truth, that there simply is no alternative to good-neighborliness and equal cooperation between the Soviet Union and China.

The further those May days of the Soviet-Chinese summit meeting recede into the past, the more clearly we perceive the historic significance of this turning point not only for our two countries, but for the world as a whole. The ending of the 25-year negative phase in the history of relations between the two biggest socialist powers and the statement on the full normalization of interstate and interparty relations—this alone is sufficient to categorize this event as extraordinary by any standards. But it is also very important to stress that firm foundations were laid for the building of a fundamentally new type of Soviet-Chinese relations for the 21st century and the more distant future, for which the political guidelines can be assessed on the basis of the accords reached between the top leaders of the USSR and the PRC.

A profound analysis of the changes that have taken place both within our countries and in the world arena resulted in the formulation in the joint communique of the legal basis for relations of a new type founded on the universal principles of intercourse between states: mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, nonaggression, noninterference in each other's internal affairs, equality and mutual advantage, and peaceful coexistence.

A necessary supplement to this was the accord to the effect that the two countries' ruling communist parties will realize contacts and exchanges in accordance with the principles of independence and autonomy, full equality, mutual respect, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Also of great significance was the mutual understanding that was reached regarding the right of each country to create its own model of socialism, consideration for differences in each other's policies and mode of action, and the openness of Soviet-Chinese relations, which are not oriented against third countries or their interests.

The period of nearly 6 months which separates us from the Beijing meeting was, as is well known, packed with important political events in the domestic and international spheres. This makes it all the more gratifying that no prolonged hiatus arose in the development of ties between Moscow and Beijing. An analysis of Soviet-Chinese relations since the May summit meeting allows us to conclude that strict compliance with the agreed principles of intercourse acts as a reliable guide even in the most difficult situations. A convincing example of this is the Soviet Union's position with regard to the dramatic events in Beijing, a position which combines noninterference in the neighboring state's affairs with a sincere commitment to China's stable socialist devleopment along the path of transformations and the resolution of the most pressing problems by means of political dialogue between the authorities and the people.

It is also noteworthy that the implementation of the Beijing accords did not turn into a mere formal campaign, but is increasingly taking on the qualities of a stable process characterized by the deepening of dialogue, the growth of mutual trust, and the tackling of concrete action and new spheres of cooperation.

The fourth session of the Soviet-Chinese Commission on Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation took place in Moscow in July, with the participation of a PRC delegation headed by Tian Jiyun, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and deputy premier of the State Council. A wide range of questions of extending ties in key spheres for the two countries was discussed, and particular attention was devoted to cooperation in consumer goods production. An agreement was reached to complete by the end of this year the formulation of a long-term program for cooperation in these spheres for the period through the year 2000. In connection with the commencement of the recruitment and utilization of Chinese manpower in the USSR, the sides agreed to draft an intergovernmental agreement.

The Chinese Science and Technology Festival in Moscow was a great success, as was the exhibition of the PRC's achievements. Specialists from the two countries had the opportunity to form a better idea of the existence of wide prospects for cooperation in these very important spheres.

Interparliamentary ties have reached a new level: In September a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, visited China. Thorough talks with Chinese parliamentarians and enthusiastic conversations with the PRC leaders showed once again how useful it is, in the conditions of profound reforms, to exchange experience of the work of the highest organs of state power.

An important step has been taken in the sphere of interparty contacts and exchanges. In September, after a gap of nearly 25 years, a delegation of CPC workers visited the Soviet Union, headed by Zhu Liang, member of the CPC Central Committee and chief of the CPC Central Committee International Relations Department. During this visit the basic guidelines for ties between the CPSU and the CPC for 1989-1990 were agreed, with a view to giving concrete content to the relevant accords reached at the Soviet-Chinese summit meeting. An invitation was conveyed from M.S. Gorbachev to Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, to visit the USSR at a convenient time.

It is well known that in the course of the meeting between the top leaders of the Soviet Union and China there was a constructive discussion of two problems that hold a special place in the entire range of bilateral relations. These are the final resolutions of the problem of a border settlement, and measures to eliminate one of the gravest consequences of the confrontation of the sixties and seventies—the military confrontation along the Soviet-Chinese border.

By mutual agreement, the fourth round of border talks was held in Beijing in the second half of October, at the level of government delegations.

In November a group of diplomatic and military experts will begin work in Moscow, discussing the problem of eliminating elements of military confrontation from Soviet-Chinese relations. Successful progress at these talks is promoted by the USSR's unilateral initiatives concerning the reduction in the grouping of Soviet troops stationed in eastern regions by 200,000 men, 120,000 of them in the Far East, in 1989-1990, as well as the 75-percent reduction in the Soviet military contingent temporarily deployed in Mongolia which was agreed with the Mongolian Government and has already been partially implemented.

The all-around development of relations is inconceivable without the utilization of the wide potential offered by "people's diplomacy." In recent months contacts and exchanges through social organizations have been stepped up considerably: Delegations from the PRC trade union and women's federations, headed by their leaders, have visited the Soviet Union; in the course of the visit to China by V. Mironenko, first secretary of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League, ties between the two countries' communist youth leagues were normalized; and the role of friendship societies as coordinators in the establishment of new forms of ties has increased.

Now that the Soviet Union and China are, so to speak, rediscovering each other, special significance is attached to contacts among the public and workers in culture, art, and science, and to broad communication between ordinary people. The recent tour by the Bolshoi Ballet in the PRC was a success, while Soviet audiences were able to assess properly the remarkable art of the masters of the Chinese circus. Cooperation between border regions is becoming livelier, more open and democratic.

The distinctive feature of Soviet-Chinese exchanges and meetings at various levels is the interest displayed by both sides in the mutual exchange of experience in implementing perestroyka and reforms and the theory and practice of renewing socialism. It is also important that a new type of dialogue is developing which excludes any kind of imposition of one's own views on the other.

The process of developing Soviet-Chinese ties is in general seen positively and calmly by foreign observers, because, far from being accompanied by a change in the strategic distribution of forces and the established practice of international contacts on the part of the USSR and the PRC, it in fact leads to the further normalization of the situation and the strengthening of security in the Asian and Pacific region and throughout the world.

Of course, the realism and soberness that are needed in politics, the existence of the difficult legacy of the past, and the experience and lessons of history give us no grounds for assuming that Soviet-Chinese relations are guaranteed to move forward automatically in the future and that problems of one kind or another will not arise along that path, problems which will require considerable efforts and will on both sides.

If you take the trade and economic sphere of Soviet-Chinese relations, today matters are on the whole developing quite well here, and this year a record trade turnover is expected, of R2 billion (in 1988 the figure was R1.85 billion). However, the opportunity to climb several degrees higher and achieve a major shift will largely be determined by the general progress in perestroyka in the USSR and the reforms in China. The enormous potential of cooperation can be uncovered when political decisions bring real benefits to both peoples, first and foremost as regards improving their daily living standard.

Soviet, Chinese UN Associations Meet in Moscow

OW2710145889 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 20 Oct 89

[Text] A delegation of the United Nations Association of China began a discussion meeting with its Soviet counterpart in Moscow on 19 October. The Chinese delegation is led by Bi Jilong, president of the association. Both sides discussed support by the Soviet Union and China for the efforts of the United Nations in striving for peace, security, and international cooperation. They will also discuss the issue of expanding cooperation between the two associations.

Near East & South Asia

Falin Receives South Yemen Party Delegation

PM3010143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Friendly Ties"]

[Text] V.M. Falin, chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, received 26 October the delegation of Yemen Socialist Party [YSP] party workers headed by S.S. Muhammad, deputy general secretary of the YSP Central Committee, which is in Moscow.

Opinions were exchanged on certain topical questions of relations between and USSR the the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY].

Ahmad 'Abdallah 'Abd al-Ilah, PDRY ambassador to the USSR, attended the talks.

PDRY's Al-'Attas Lauds Ties on Treaty Anniversary

LD2510105589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 25 Oct 89

[Interview with Chairman of PDRY Supreme People's Council Abu Bakr al-'Attas with correspondent Murashkin in Aden; date of interview not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] It is 10 years today since treaties on friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen were signed. Aleksandr Murashkin, our correspondent in Aden, reports:

[Murashkin] The treaty signed in October 1979 was the natural continuation of Soviet-Yemeni relations which date back to the 1920's. [passage omitted] The Soviet Union continues to provide help in developing the Yemeni national economy today. Various industrial installations are being erected in South Yemen with the technical cooperation of Soviet specialists, as are hospitals and schools. [passage omitted]

In an interview for All-Union Radio in connection with the 10th anniversary of the treaty on friendship and cooperation, Haydar Abu Bakr al-'Attas, member of the Yemeni Socialist Party Politburo and chairman of the Supreme People's Council of the PDRY said in particular:

[Begin Al-'Attas recording in Arabic, fading into Russian translation] Democratic Yemen and the Soviet Union are linked by lasting friendly relations. We think highly of the help and support of Soviet people in the cause of consolidating the national economy of the Republic and strengthening its defensive ability. The policy of perestroyka which is being implemented in the USSR and the new political thinking are met with most widespread approval in Democratic Yemen. These processes have their beneficial influence both on the people and on the leadership of Democratic Yemen. We have realized that our country needs some perestroyka of its own. At present a draft for the all-embracing reform of political and economic life is being formulated. It is fully in accordance with the interests of the working masses of the PDRY.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate our Soviet friends on this anniversary. May relations of friendship and cooperation between our peoples and parties grow stronger and develop. [end recording]

Soviet-PDRY Cooperation Talks Held in Aden

LD1810220389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1420 GMT 18 Oct 89

[Text] Aden, 18 Oct (TASS)—In connection with the forthcoming 10th anniversary of the treaty on friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY], a roundtable discussion on cooperation between the two countries in culture, education, and the training of national cadres has taken place here. Representatives of the Supreme People's Council and the PDRY Council of Ministers, the Yemen Socialist Party Central Committee, staff of the USSR Embassy and trade mission in the PDRY attended it.

Since the early 1970's the Soviet Union has trained more than 14,000 South Yemeni specialists, including those in such important fields as medicine, agriculture, fisheries, communications, and others. Special attention was given to the training of national Yemeni cadres for work at projects which are being constructed with Soviet economic and technical assistance. More than 18,000 technicians and skilled workers have been trained during the construction and exploitation of the projects.

At present, the possibility of complete replacement of Soviet specialists with Yemeni national cadres at the economic and technical cooperation projects is being considered.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Gorbachev Envoy Meets With Ethiopia's Mengistu

*PM3010143989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4*

[TASS report: "Opinions Exchanged"]

[Text] Addis Ababa, 26 Oct—Mengistu Haile Mariam, general secretary of the Workers Party of Ethiopia [WPE] Central Committee and Ethiopian president, has received Yu.M. Vorontsov—special envoy of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, member of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR first deputy foreign minister—who was here 25-26 October. Yu.M. Vorontsov gave him a message from M.S. Gorbachev.

Yu.M. Vorontsov also had talks with Berhanu Bayeh, member of the WPE Central Committee Politburo and Ethiopian foreign minister; and Ashagre Yigletu, secretary of the WPE Central Committee and chief of the Central Committee International Department. Questions of the further development of Soviet-Ethiopian relations and a number of international problems were discussed.

East Europe

Hungarian, Polish Roles in Warsaw Pact Viewed

Primakov Rules Out Interference

*LD3010095189 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 0500 GMT 30 Oct 89*

[Text] According to prestigious Soviet politicians, the Soviet Union would not interfere if Hungary were to decide to leave the Warsaw Pact.

Academician Primakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, and Shishlin, head of a CPSU Central Committee department, outlined their opinion as members of a parliamentarian delegation that is holding talks in the United States at present. They pointed out that the Soviet party strictly abides by the principle of noninterference.

More on Primakov, Shishlin Comments

*LD3010203889 Budapest Television Service
in Hungarian 1830 GMT 30 Oct 89*

[Text] The question of Hungary or Poland leaving the Warsaw Pact is not on the agenda, thus it is not worth pursuing this question even in theory. This is the opinion of Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Aboimov. He added that in any event it is the official standpoint of the governments concerned that is to be taken as authoritative. Two high-ranking Soviet politicians spoke about the same subject in the United States: Nikolay Shishlin, CPSU spokesman, and Yevgeniy Primakov, chairman of one of the chambers of the Soviet Parliament. Andras Heltai reports on the details.

[Heltai] In a television interview, Primakov rejected the possibility that the Soviet Union would use force to impede the GDR possibly leaving the Warsaw Pact. As an example, he referred to Moscow's policy, acknowledging the changes in Poland and Hungary. The other Soviet representative, Shishlin, to the question of whether Soviet interests would be threatened by Hungary's neutrality, declared they are not afraid of the changes, and they will in any event respect Hungarian decisions. Anyway, the Soviet politicians added hurriedly, their information is that Hungary does not intend to leave the Warsaw Pact.

Aboymov on Pact Countries' Commitment

*LD3010200989 Budapest Domestic Service
in Hungarian 1730 GMT 30 Oct 89*

[Text] Hungary and Poland do not want to leave the Warsaw Pact, therefore it is not worth raising this issue even in theory. This was stated by Ivan Aboymov, Soviet deputy foreign minister. The leading diplomat, accompanied by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, took part in the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers' meeting, and affirmed that both Budapest and Warsaw continue to adhere to alliance commitments.

At the same time, Aboymov avoided responding to the statement made by Yevgeniy Primakov in the United States. The chairman of the Soviet Parliament said, in fact, that Hungary's leaving the eastern military bloc is possible in principle. Aboymov explained the participation of the member states' foreign trade ministers at the consultation by saying that the Warsaw Pact must more and more change into a political military organization.

APN Cited on USSR Intervention in Hungary

*LD3010163489 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1537 GMT 30 Oct 89*

[Text] Moscow, Oct 30 (TANJUG)—"Hungarians can sleep peacefully: Soviet tanks will not go to Budapest," the Soviet news agency APN [NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY] reported, commenting the deep changes in Hungary.

Ten years ago, no one could have said with certainty that the Soviet leadership, faced with radical reforms which fundamentally change the political order in an allied country, would not have taken resolute measures, including military force since Budapest 1965 and Prague 1968 have not been forgotten, the APN said.

However, those who say that the Soviet Union has not interfered in Hungary's affairs because the Kremlin leadership "is busy with internal problems and does not have the strength, means or resolve for an armed intervention" are wrong, the APN wrote. The fact is that the concept of "limited sovereignty" in East European socialist countries is not in the framework of the Soviet Union's new foreign policy and has ceased to exist as such, the agency reported.

The APN commentary cited Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's speech in the Supreme Soviet, when he said that "alternative forces have appeared on the political stage of some allied countries. These forces were not brought in by anyone, they came because that is what the people want."

Moscow TV Queries Egon Krenz on GDR 'Renewal'

LD3010230289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1952 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Interview with Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, by unidentified correspondent, on 30 October; place not given; questions and answers in German with superimposed Russian translation—recorded]

[Text] [Correspondent] Comrade Krenz, what is the essence and the main content of the process of renewal underway in the GDR? What, in your view, made this renewal necessary?

[Krenz] First and foremost, I wish to convey a most sincere message of greetings to all the Soviet comrades and to wish you, dear comrades, new successes in the cause of perestroyka. [Previous sentence in Russian] We, too, are facing similar problems. What I have in mind is that, following the Leninist course, we are doing all we can to make sure that creative socialism becomes something that the entire people feel belongs to them. I do not want to say that we did not do this in the past. A great deal has been accomplished in our country. A state of workers and peasants in the center of Europe represents a new phenomenon for the continent and the entire world alike. And this state did much for the people.

However, phenomena have appeared which, in the view of our Central Committee, have not always in day-to-day life coincided with what we have been telling the public. In other words, certain divergences appeared between what was said and what was done. If a thing like that does happen then the party should ask itself how to change it. The main essence of the activities of communists is in moving with the people and doing everything for the people. That is why, beginning with our Central Committee plenum, we defined a task for ourselves: to turn around and face the people and to discuss all issues in an honest and open way.

Prior to the Central Committee plenum a slogan was put forward: "Continuity and renewal". And at the Central Committee plenum we stated: "Renewal and sensible continuity". This means we wish to preserve all that is good, useful, and valuable and that had made its appearance in the GDR during the period of construction of developed socialism. And we want to start renewal in all spheres. Shortly we shall be holding the 10th SED Central Committee Plenum. I am sure that there we shall discuss the program of action which will concern all spheres of public life. Of course, in first place stands the national economy. And we intend to carry out a fundamental economic reform. I would not want today to anticipate things and name the specific directions in which the reform will be conducted because the party, acting on the basis of its charter, must decide these questions collectively and this has to be determined by the Central Committee plenum. There will also be talk of the broad development of socialist democracy.

Recently, visiting one of the enterprises, I said that for us democracy is necessary like the air we breathe, and before the main word democracy, we rightly use the word socialist, bearing in mind that socialist democracy should never be compared to bourgeois democracy. One is designed for the people, and the other for the bourgeoisie. This should not be confused.

There will also be talk of the fact that in our mass media we should not cease to demonstrate our achievements. For, after all, we are working for the sake of achieving successes, and successes are the most important thing. We shall show how these successes are achieved, what contradictions have to be overcome. We used to have, as it were, sports reports, when only the start and finish is shown, when the viewer does not see what efforts were needed in order to achieve the finish. But now we want to show everything, the start, what efforts were necessary, and finally to show how, thanks to the efforts of the working class and of the whole people, the final result is achieved.

In this way, to sum up what I have said, I would like to point out that in the process of renewal, it is a question of continuing further that which has been started, to go boldly to meet half-way the wishes of the citizens of our country, to expand democracy and glasnost, at the same time, never forgetting that all this is taking place under the leadership of the party.

[Correspondent] Comrade Krenz, how do you assess the prospects for cooperation between the GDR and the Soviet Union?

[Krenz] First of all, I would like to note that they are being built on a sound foundation. After all, what the GDR is, is the result, first of all, of the good work of the citizens of the republic, and of their successful cooperation with our friends in the Soviet Union and with other socialist countries. Therefore, I consider that one of the most important questions of the development of the GDR on the whole is close and friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union. At the SED Central Committee Plenum, I said that the experience of perestroyka in the Soviet Union is very, very important for the GDR. We do not want a friendship of slogans to exist between us, but rather a friendship founded on firm affairs, not a friendship of declarations but a friendship between peoples. Therefore, we will strive to deepen our relations in all spheres. Of course, it cannot be any other way. We have common aims. And, naturally, the questions of carrying out foreign policy will occupy an important place and involve joint actions to preserve peace. And you know that we are not just supporting the decisive proposals of the Soviet Union aimed at the preservation of peace, but, if it can be thus expressed, we are strengthening their foundation. That is how it should be in the future, too.

As Marxists-Leninists, we know that the economy is the basis of any policy. And that means that we should discuss how cooperation in this sphere can be made closer, how we can remove from our path the barriers which exist, how we can develop direct contacts, how we, thanks to what we have in common in this sphere, can achieve greater effect. After all is said and done, the success of our cause will depend on the efficiency of our respective national economies.

Our cooperation in the sphere of science and culture is also important, the exchange of valuable experience in the sphere of youth work. In your country, just as in ours, solutions are being sought to these questions. It is a question not so much of the youth unions—of the Leninist Komsomol and the Free German Youth League—but primarily of how we work with young people. The future of the Soviet Union and the GDR depends on that. It is young people who, on the threshold of the 21st century, will determine what our state will look like. They must be able to continue what is being carried out in our countries at present. And I am very optimistic that the GDR, together with your country, will succeed in moving ahead.

The whole variety of forms of socialism that I support and the boldness shown by the CPSU notwithstanding, each country is responsible for what is happening in it, for resolving its own problems. It must never be forgotten that socialism also has an international aspect. At a time when the bourgeoisie calls: Proletarians of all countries, disunite, we should say: Socialists of all countries, unite in the joint struggle for peace and socialism.

[Correspondent] Comrade Krenz, preparations are currently underway in the GDR for the 12th SED Congress, due to be held in May next year. It is to define the country's long-term development concept. What would you, as the general secretary, single out as being the main task for the work of the party organizations during the current period?

[Krenz] Enormous work is ahead of us. Party congresses in the life of each party do not just represent the key moments; they are also important periods for analyzing and elaborating strategy. We wish to carry out the preparations for this congress in conditions of glasnost, including a nationwide discussion. And it has already begun. Thousands of people take to the streets and conduct a dialogue, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands. There is discussion in the town halls and in party committees on how to further strengthen the party's leading role. It is perfectly understandable because socialist society can develop only when the party is at the helm. And that is why renewal in the GDR is linked, above all, with the fact that the party is aware of its responsibility in all spheres.

The results of the party's activities depend, in the final analysis, on how each communist is working at his job. That is why we say that unity and cohesion in our ranks is of decisive importance for the success of our policy which began at the Ninth SED Central Committee Plenum.

This does not mean that everyone should have identical views. But unity, as understood from the point of view of the final target, requires unity of action. Personal conversations with all members of the party are now underway in the country. Very many proposals were voiced at them. Preparations are under underway for the elections to the primary party organizations. As is known, they are the basis of the party. Subsequently, regional and district party conferences will take place. Then, in May, the party congress will sum it all up and draw up a program for the next 5 years. This pertains, above all, to the new 5-Year Plan. As communists, we are dutybound to look further ahead, to take a long-term view. We would like to think about what we shall be approaching the end of this century with and with what we shall enter the next millenium.

Since we are talking about party work I would like to add the following: At the end of the week I held a meeting with the chairmen of the other parties—the Democratic Peasants' Party of Germany, the Christian Democratic Union, the Liberal Democratic Party of Germany, the National Democratic Party of Germany. We have pluralism, socialist pluralism. We need to develop it further, and the other parties are prepared for this and have once again stressed the significance of the leading role of the SED in this process.

Speaking of our party's congress, I would like to mention two factors which are particularly important in the contemporary discussion. We have no forbidden topics. We discuss all the issues which are of concern to people. But I would like to single out these two factors. The first: The GDR will remain a socialist state. Socialism is both the present and the future of our country. This is written in the Constitution and we will permit no one to shake our country's basic law, its free, democratic, and socialist foundations. Whoever does this is violating the Constitution.

Second: We are a sovereign state. Decisions must be adopted in our country by its citizens, and we will not follow advice from the West aimed at eliminating socialism. We are in favor of reforms. We do not have a negative attitude toward them. But we are in favor of reforms which provide more socialism, more democracy. And when I speak of a sovereign state, I mean that this sovereignty should be regarded within the framework of our alliance with the socialist countries, with our friends in the Soviet Union, and in consideration of our great work in the Warsaw Pact Organization and our great and creative participation in the CEMA.

[Correspondent] Comrade Krenz, our working visit to the Soviet Union begins tomorrow. What do you expect from this trip?

[Krenz] First of all, I'm very glad that my first foreign visit will be to the Soviet Union. I am also happy to be meeting Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, whom I have known for a long time and whom I hold in very high esteem and who was here as a guest during the celebrations marking the 40th anniversary of the GDR and was able to feel the attitude of the citizens of our country toward the leader of the Soviet state.

I am glad that this is a working visit. I think that every visit should be a working visit. If we call this a working visit then it means that we indeed have a great deal to do. Therefore, first and foremost, I would like to familiarize myself with the experience which you have in implementing the decisions of the party congress and the 19th party conference. This is very important for us right now, and I in my turn would like to talk about our experience and our plans. Of course, it is very interesting for me, after so many years, to return to Moscow where I was a student and where I still have many friends from the Lenin Komsomol, many of whom today are in party work.

I am travelling to your country with great hopes for interesting work; to strengthen our friendship and cooperation; to strengthen personal contacts, and therefore permit me once [following passage to the end in Russian] to wish all television viewers new successes, robust health. As they say in our country: Siberian health, and new, new, successes in the cause of strengthening socialism and peace.

TASS Cites ADN on Krenz Address to Officers

LD3010195189 Moscow TASS in English 1612 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—The GDR is experiencing a revolutionary beginning of far-reaching changes for more socialism and more democracy, party and state leader Egon Krenz has said.

This was happening on the basis of what has been jointly achieved, he said in Berlin on Monday [30 October] addressing officers who completed university studies this year. Reasonably seen, these achievements could stand their test before the eyes of the world after all.

The commanders, political and staff officers were starting their career at a time which required extreme efforts and highest concentration of thoughts, Krenz, who is also chairman of the National Defence Council, said.

GDR Authorities' Response to Demonstrations Noted

PM3010105589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "GDR: Land in Flux"]

[Text] Berlin—Egon Krenz, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee, has met in Berlin with Wolfgang Mischnick, chairman of the Free Democratic Party of Germany faction in Bonn's Bundestag. He said at the meeting that the reforms planned in the GDR should lead to higher national economic efficiency and expand working people's participation in running the country. The course of renewing society has been supported by broad sections of the people. But, Krenz said, if the West continues to suggest reforms which would jeopardize our social system, there is not the slightest chance of such recommendations being implemented.

Street processions and rallies are continuing. In Neubrandenburg 20,000 people held a "march of hope," which ended with a rally in the city center. The speakers said that the dialogue that has been begun should be conducted in a spirit of openness and trust. It should be businesslike and not dodge any difficult problems. Those present were addressed by Johannes Chemnitzer, first secretary of the SED bezirk committee. Urgent problems, he said, cannot be solved by street demonstrations.

The same idea was stated by Berlin police chief Friedhelm Rausch, speaking on TV. The 12,000 demonstrators who marched through the capital's central streets Tuesday included people "looking for trouble." Traffic in the city center was brought to a complete standstill.

The question of the use of police during the recent unsanctioned demonstrations and the charges that they exceeded their authority continue to be extensively discussed in the GDR. A statement was issued by Wolfgang Herger, chairman of the People's Chamber Security Committee. He said that for the past few weeks law-enforcement organs had received strict orders to show restraint and intervene only in the event of violence or the threat of violence.

The overwhelming majority of demonstrations and rallies have passed off peacefully. But, as has already been reported, during the 7 and 8 October unsanctioned demonstrations in Berlin, Leipzig, and Dresden there was trouble which, in W. Herger's words, threatened public order and citizens' safety. Hooligans who had wormed their way into the demonstrators' ranks shouted insults against the police and threw rocks, bottles, and metal objects at them. As a result of these incidents 106 policemen and 46 demonstrators were injured.

The demonstration in Berlin started at Alexanderplatz, in the heart of the capital. Young people shouted: "To the Brandenburg Gate!" Information was received that a massive, violent storming of the state border was planned in the vicinity of the Brandenburg Gate. Decisive measures were taken. Unfortunately, in a number of cases passers-by were injured during the trouble on the streets. Illegal actions were committed against people detained in police custody. Complaints about these actions have been lodged with the prosecutor.

Guenter Schabowski, first secretary of the SED bezirk committee, gave an interview to correspondents of West Germany's ARD TV. The most important elements of a rule-of-law state are already present in the GDR, he said. Needless to say, these will be continuously improved. To a question from correspondents about whether a dialogue would be conducted with "new opposition groups," he replied: "Discussions with people associated with opposition groups have long been under way."

G. Schabowski confirmed that soon—in the next few months—all GDR citizens will receive a foreign-travel [zagranichnyy] passport and, on obtaining the relevant visa, will be able to travel to any country as they see fit.

IZVESTIYA Notes Decisions, Changes in GDR

PM3110114789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 29 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch: "GDR: Important Decisions"]

[Text] Berlin—Demonstrations are continuing in various GDR cities. About 12,000 participated in a street march in Dresden. A peaceful 10,000-strong demonstration took place in Karl-Marx-Stadt, then its participants spilled into clubs and churches to continue the discussion started earlier. In the northwest of the country 20,000 people participated in demonstrations in Guestrow. In the small town of Lauchhammer 3,500 inhabitants organized a rally at which ecological problems were mainly discussed. About 8,000 people marched through the streets of the district town of Saalfeld. The demands of the demonstration's participants were the same as before: more freedom, democracy, and glasnost. Recently a new slogan has been added: The alternative "New Forum" movement should be recognized.

Yesterday in Berlin's Red Rathaus Professor Klaus Thielmann, the GDR's minister of health, met with a large group of medical workers. I would like to note that among those who left the GDR for the FRG in recent weeks there are quite a lot of medical workers—a situation which has noticeably complicated the situation regarding the republic's health care. At the meeting with the minister the question of how to improve the present situation was discussed. The minister announced that medical workers' wages will be increased. They will be assisted by GDR army doctors and orderlies, and living conditions for medical personnel will be improved by giving them empty apartments which belonged to those who have left for the West.

The newspapers are publishing the decision of the GDR People's Chamber on an amnesty. It is declared for those who before 27 October this year tried to cross the republic's border illegally and were detained, and also for those who violated public order during the recent unsanctioned demonstrations. The amnesty does not extend to those who were involved in violent or armed activities, or who harmed people's health.

The GDR Ministry of Interior reports that as of 1 November visa-free travel by GDR citizens to Czechoslovakia is being restored. Visas for trips to the CSSR were introduced temporarily this month because of the mass exodus of GDR citizens across CSSR territory to Hungary, and thence to Austria and the FRG. According to a Council of Ministers decision, from now on those wishing to leave the republic will be able to ask permission from the local internal affairs administration. Citizens' applications to leave will be examined quickly. The Ministry of Interior report says that the route to the West via an FRG embassy abroad does GDR citizens more harm than good.

According to information reaching Berlin, the flow of migrants from the GDR to the FRG has dropped noticeably of late. Their "onslaught" on the West German Embassy in Warsaw has diminished significantly. It is also reported that 110 GDR citizens who had earlier migrated to the FRG have returned. I would remind you that a few days ago the GDR Government adopted a decision to allow citizens who had left the republic in recent weeks to return home; they are not threatened with any sanctions.

Specific steps are being taken to improve relations with the Federal Republic. It has been decided to extend the agreement concluded 3 months ago between the GDR airline "Interflug" and the West German "Lufthansa" under which direct air routes linked Leipzig with Frankfurt am Main and Dusseldorf.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Perestroyka, Changes

AU3010150889 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 27-29 Oct 89 pp 4,5

[Interview with Eduard Shevardnadze, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union, by Adam Michnik, editor in chief of GAZETA WYBORCZA: "Why Has Our Relationship to Other Nations Changed?—Because Our Relationship to Our Own People Has Changed" place and date not given]

[Text] [Michnik] Tengiz Abuladze told me that it was only thanks to your support that he was able to make his film "Penance." At that time you were first secretary of the Central Committee of the Georgian Communist party. Can you tell us more about it?

[Shevardnadze] Quite simply, we were and still are friends. When I saw the film I knew that it had been made by a man who had understood the tragedy of the 1930's. Work was proceeding on the film, but we all realized that the film might never be shown. However, I believed that we could not refuse to make this film. This tragic period of our history had to be recorded for posterity. We all believed that there might come a time when this film would become necessary; necessary in the sense that the subject matter with which it was concerned, should never again be repeated. Knowing that we would not receive any financing from Moscow, we financed it through the union of Georgian filmmakers, and other social organizations. When we saw the first version, we realized two things; one, that the film was masterfully done, and two, it was doubtful whether it could ever be distributed. Later came perestroyka, and Tengiz remembered his film. All my friends saw it, politicians and artists alike. Mikhail Gorbachev also saw it. Everyone was of the opinion that the film was absolutely necessary. It was not only a great work of art but a document of our tragic history.

[Michnik] Is there a specifically Georgian view of Stalin and his legacy?

[Shevardnadze] Stalin cannot be blamed for everything. It is not just a question of individuals, but the means of disinformation and abberations that were current at the time. All the peoples of the Soviet Union suffered equally as a result of this. Leningrad, and our capital city Moscow suffered. At that time Nikita Khrushchev was first secretary there. I recall full well what was happening in Georgia at that time. My father was a teacher. I remember the arrest of the leader and other members of the kolkhoz for alleged participation in a conspiracy. What conspiracies? It was a tragedy for the whole nation. Not only the leaders of the intelligentsia and party cadres suffered, the ordinary people suffered as well. My father had been warned by the Peoples Commisariat of Internal Affairs officials that he was in danger of being arrested. It was exactly at the time of the famous 1938 All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee Plenum. The repressions did not stop, but they abated slightly, and many people were set free from prisons and labor camps.

The same things that were happening in the other republics—the good and the bad— were also happening in Georgia. During the war years, Georgia lost as many of its people as did the Ukraine—that is to say, proportionately as many. It lost 260,000 of its population out of 3 million. Georgia did not enjoy any privileges during Stalin's time. On the contrary, Stalin tried to make Georgia a showcase and example of his politics. Were the Georgians proud of him? Did they try to defend him? After the 20th Congress, there were demonstrations in Georgia protesting against attempts at unmasking Stalin. These were mainly manifestations by the young people, and on a very dramatic scale. Firearms were used, and there were deaths. This was the price that Georgia paid during the years of the Stalin cult.

[Michnik] You are considered one of the architects of the new Soviet foreign policy. I would like to ask you about the links between the internal and international policies. If one can cite the Brezhnev doctrine as reflecting the times of stagnation, then "perestroyka" is characterized by the "new thinking" in international relations. You talked about this recently at a session of the Supreme Soviet. You categorically condemned the intervention in Afghanistan. Are you willing to do the same in relation to the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968?

[Shevardnadze] I would like to clarify one point here. I do not like the term "architect of the new policy." Foreign policy is always a continuation of domestic policy. Why has our relationship to other nations changed? Simply because our relationship to our own people has changed. Why has our relationship to international legal conventions changed? Simply because we began to adapt different norms for our own peoples and citizens.

I would not say that during Brezhnev's time there was any terrible despotism. One could work. Some things succeeded and some did not. I for example, chose to work. The people who assumed the lead in the perestroyka—among others, Gorbachev—did not find absolute emptiness. Even during Brezhnev's times we knew quite well what our aims were.

We have told the whole truth about Afghanistan. I must say, however, that the people who made the decision about intervening with armed force did not plan to stay in Afghanistan for any length of time, or to create the 16th or the 17th Soviet republic. They were driven, as was the case of past generations, by the concept of revolutionary solidarity and internationalism. There was real threat of foreign intervention in Afghanistan, and even at the present time there are people who are intervening in Afghanistan. I know this from first hand sources. This was probably the cause for the decision to intervene in force—we intervene with our armed forces to help, and later, Afghanistan can decide for itself.

I think that this was an incorrect, and badly thought out decision, the total situation was not evaluated thoroughly. We have corrected that mistake. We took the difficult decision of pulling out the Army from Afghanistan. The vast majority of society backed us on this, but there were also others who thought differently. I think that we acted correctly. Now Afghans are trying to solve their own problems. Czechoslovakia is a different matter. The decision to intervene with armed force was taken jointly. I consider myself among those politicians who treat joint decisions very seriously. The decision in 1968 was made by the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states, namely the then first secretaries, and the chairmen of the defense councils. There were also appeals from Czechoslovakia itself. The evaluation of those days from today's standpoint can only be changed by a joint decision. It is a very complex, delicate, and difficult issue.

The comparison with the intervention of the Soviet Army in Afghanistan is not applicable. It happened in different historical conditions, and further, only we were involved in making the decision to intervene in Afghanistan. We were the sole authors and the sole party implementing this decision.

Czechoslovakia is quite different. I think that it is inadmissible to allow anyone else to try and impose his own point of view of those events. I fully support the evaluation reached by the leadership of the communist party and government of Czechoslovakia, and consider it binding. Any other position would be a gross mistake. We have once and for all refuted the policy of imposing one's own opinion on others. It is unacceptable if one considers the customs prevailing between civilized states. If we were to express some dissatisfaction with your new government, it would be impossible to reconcile with the prevailing norms of the current political climate. Czechoslovakia is a sovereign state and has an undisputable right to evaluate its own history as it wishes.

[Michnik] One of my Russian friends referring to Czechoslovakia has said: "In the U.S. Army in Vietnam there were also Australian units, namely, a whole battalion." I think that regarding joint decision making during Brezhnev's time, things today would be somewhat different. I was in Czechoslovakia and talked with various people, including Dubcek. He asked me a rhetorical question: "What the Soviet comrades are doing today is far more radical than what we were doing in 1968. But why cannot this be said openly?" Here in Poland and in Hungary, the parliaments have stated that the invasion was a mistake, and we regret it very much. I think that many people in Czechoslovakia are waiting to hear this said publicly by the leaders of the Soviet Union. The Czechs and Slovaks are saying that at present in the Soviet Union it is a time of hope, while in Czechoslovakia it is a time of stagnation.

[Shevardnadze] The past appraisals by the Czech party leaders do not differ in any respect from the appraisal of the present leaders. We respect this position. If I should declare in Moscow that owing to the changes that have taken place in Poland—new people in the Sejm and government—I was not prepared to go to Warsaw because the Polish premier is not a communist, then such an attitude would not be compatible with the elementary norms of current political culture. We do not want to be seen acting in this way. Czechoslovakia is a sovereign state, in which there are party and state structures which decide on the politics of the state. We respect their views, just as we respect the choice that the Polish nation has made. We may not totally like the fact that the communists are no longer at the Polish helm, but we respect the will of the Polish people. All things that undermine the sovereign rights of the party, the state, and the government, are exclusively the internal matter of the particular country, and you should not criticize this approach, but on the contrary, you should support it.

[Michnik] But it is evident that we do.

[Shevardnadze] Let us leave the subject of Czechoslovakia, and perhaps pass on to Polish-Soviet affairs.

[Michnik] You have said that the Soviet Union finds the Polish experience very interesting. What do you mean by it? Is it the political changes and the great compromise between forces which only yesterday were still antagonists, or the economic changes?

[Shevardnadze] I do not know whether I have said anything on this so directly. I think I spoke about economic cooperation, and also, if I remember correctly, economic cooperation with the West. We support our Polish friends developing their economic contacts with the West. Your experiences of cooperation with the West will, after all, be useful to us too.

[Michnik] Oh, you mean in this sense....

[Shevardnadze] Let us not talk about who is in government in your country and who is in government in ours. In my opinion, we have a common problem—the problem of consolidation; consolidation of all forces, and I would even say—of all alternative forces—in order to solve the problems which are fundamental. If Poland wants to emerge unscathed from its complicated situation—and you know better than I do just how difficult your situation really is—then there must be a consolidation of the whole nation. A consolidation of all parties, movements, and all religions. I consider that you have made great progress in this direction.

But we have different conditions, experiences, and different characteristics. We have a multi-nation state, and each republic has its specific problems. We have national, ecological, and economic problems. The consolidation of the whole society, all nations in the interests of perestroyka and democratization is our number one problem. In these spheres I see the possibilities for an exchange of views, and if you want, experiences. People's fronts, unofficial organizations—not all in accordance with the Constitution or party regulations—are springing up. But these are all living structures, and if we wish to build a democratic state where the rule of law is observed—and we want to achieve this—then we must unite.

[Michnik] In this context what do you make of the return to the political stage of yesterday's dissidents, for example, Academician Sakharov? You referred to him in your UN speech. How is the process of reconciliation with yesterday's dissidents proceeding?

[Shevardnadze] The most spectacular example is our democracy. We do not fear people who hold opposing views. On the contrary, we respect those people who put forward their views with honesty. This, of course, does not apply to demagogues. Such people are dangerous to the Soviet Union as well as for Poland. I define demagogues as people who seek cheap popularity. Those people who are sincerely convinced of the existence of alternative solutions and defend their views, deserve unlimited respect. In the Supreme Soviet there are many deputies who stick to their views, and do not agree with others—this is also an illustration of democracy. But democracy is subject to the law. There is a majority, and there is a minority, and it is the majority that decides.

[Michnik] A key problem of Soviet policy today is the creation of a common European home. How will this Central and Eastern European home look in future? For that matter, how will it look in the Soviet Union itself? Ordinary people and even the leaderships believe that the structure formed during the Stalinist period is now obsolete. Many of your Supreme Soviet deputies openly speak of the need for a confederation. Even communists, for example, in the Baltic republics, have also been calling for this. Where is all this leading to in the Soviet Union, and in Central and Eastern Europe?

[Shevardnadze] This common home is not an unusual structure which has to be built on ruins. We are already building this structure, when we engage ourselves in trying to solve the problem of disarmament, and seek for ways which would eliminate the possibility of armed confrontation between East and West Europe. This is also an important element of this common home. More confidence and less fear. More contacts and elements of integration, for example, economic contact. As a recent example we proposed the elaboration of joint legal regulations at the Paris Conference. This is a new initiative. This is a concept that should be acceptable to socialist states and bourgeois-democracies. We are intensifying relations with the European Community, and with the Council of Europe. These too are elements of this new common home. We are developing economic relations. We are considering the All-European ecological project. Of course we shall remain ourselves. They believe that socialism will disappear, but this is impossible.

[Michnik] Just between us then, do you know what socialism really is?

[Shevardnadze] Do you know what capitalism is?

[Michnik] I do not know either.

[Shevardnadze] Socialism, as I conceive it, is an ideal society.

[Michnik] My last question. When do you think the time will come when I shall be able to read in PRAVDA an article entitled: "The whole truth about Katyn"?

[Shevardnadze] I answered this question sometime before. I think that, first, there already is a commission, and, second, one should not hinder it in its workings. We are interested in the truth and nothing but the truth. You know full well that we have brought out a lot of things and even more into the open in the Soviet Union. We are not lacking courage, if an atrocity was perpetrated then we shall have to own up to it. There can be no other way. But the matter has to be investigated very thoroughly and competently, it has to be based on scientific premises. Facts are needed, that is all.

Shevardnadze 25 Oct Remarks to PAP Published

AU3110093289 Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 28-29 Oct 89 p 7

[Remarks made to PAP by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on 25 October in Warsaw before giving an interview to PAP's Jozef Rzeszut: "Minister Shevardnadze on the State of and Prospects for USSR-Polish Relations"]

[Text] Asked to give an immediate assessment of the course of his visit and the basic results that it had produced, Minister Shevardnadze said:

"What I can say at this point is that it has been a very necessary visit. We have traditionally had ongoing contacts with the Polish leadership at the highest level, at a high level, and so on. Much has changed lately. Poland has a new government—a coalition government. It is natural that we should both want to meet and discuss the future of our relations and their prospects, to assess the stage of cooperation that we are currently at, and to give serious consideration to the present. I think that we basically managed to accomplish this.

"There are a few general observations to be made. There are no differences between us regarding the fundamental importance of Polish-Soviet relations for the Soviet and Polish peoples, as well as for stability and peace in Europe. That is the first point. Second, we agree that all the good and positive things that have been achieved in our relations should be preserved. Third, we agreed that our relations should be developed and a greater degree of dynamism should be imparted to them. This particularly applies to economic cooperation as well as to ensuring greater efficiency in mutually advantageous, equal cooperation in the economic field and in other domains. There is one more very important observation to made. We speak a common language and understand each other on the question of remaining faithful to the fundamental agreements that have been concluded between our states and remaining faithful to our alliance obligations and the principles on which the Warsaw Pact was formed."

Polish Group Arrives in Katyn, Visits Memorial

LD3110042389 Warsaw PAP in English 0039 GMT 31 Oct 89

[By PAP Special Correspondent Norbert Potocki]

[Text] Smolensk, Oct. 30—A group of over 400 Poles from all parts of Poland arrived on October 30 [Monday] at the mass graves of Polish officers murdered in Katyn. For the majority of those in the group it was the first chance to visit the place of execution of their relatives. They arrived to the Soviet Union by a special train on a journey organized at the initiative of the "Katyn Families", by the Council for the Commemoration of Struggle and Martyrdom and the PTTK Travel Agency.

By coincidence at the same time, tribute to soldiers of the Polish Army was paid also by American political science expert of Polish descent, former national security adviser to U.S. President Carter, Zbigniew Brzezinski.

The group laid flowers and soil brought from Poland on mass graves covered with grass. Soil from Katyn will be taken home. A mass was held celebrated by Father Michal Czajkowski, Father Jozef Jachimczuk and Father Aleksandr Bandura. Father Jachimczuk delivered a homily. It is only recently that we can come on visits here, he said.

I never believed that I will come here, said 79 year old Jozef Janocha, who lost his brother Stanislaw, a captain in the Polish Army.

Participants in the pilgrimage also toured a railway station in Gnezdowo, where years ago Polish officers leaving trains were transported by cars to the place of their execution several kilometres away.

The Soviet TV broadcast a reportage from Katyn lasting several minutes in the Vremya news bulletin Monday. The reportage presented a religious and patriotic ceremony commemorating Polish officers murdered there.

Former President Carter's national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski told Soviet reporter that he was brought there not by personal tragedy, as most of these people, but rather by the awareness of the symbolic significance of Katyn. He said that Russians and Poles oppressed to death lay there together.

Brzezinski thought that it was very important to say the truth about what had happened there. He said that only thanks to truth the new Soviet leadership could dissociate itself from the crimes of Stalin and the NKVD. He said that only the truth could be a foundation for genuine friendship between the Polish people and peoples of the USSR.

Brzezinski said that truth would pave the road for itself and at least the fact that he could come there strengthened this conviction of his.

Embassy Official Comments on Katyn, Relations

AU2310173689 Warsaw SZTANDAR MLODYCH in Polish 20-22 Oct 89 p 3

[Interview with Aleksandr Oskin, first secretary of the Soviet Embassy in Warsaw, by Marek Rudzinski: "History Is Important, But the Future Is Even More Important"—date, place not given]

[Text] [Rudzinski] How have the changes in the Polish political scene—the defeat of the Polish United Workers Party in the elections and the appointment of a representative of "Solidarity" to the post of premier—affected Polish-Soviet relations?

[Oskin] I think that they have hardly affected them at all in practical terms. Our leaders had already said previously that the changes in Poland are the internal affair of Poland and its people. In addition, the Polish Government headed by Tadeusz Mazowiecki announced that it would observe all existing international agreements. We, for our part, do not envisage there being any changes in this area. I suppose that the Polish side will not be instituting any changes as well.

[Rudzinski] Recently, some Soviet politicians and various publications have talked about anti-Soviet incidents in Poland, especially in light of the events and demonstrations connected with 17 September. What does the term "anti-Soviet" mean today?

[Oskin] This is a wide-ranging issue. On the one hand, we have what I would call the primitive, zoological form of anti-Sovietism that manifests itself in demonstrators who fail to understand the issues, shouting "Soviets go home," throwing stones, and desecrating the graves of Soviet soldiers. I think that, although incidents of this kind occur in Poland, they do not reflect the Poles' attitude toward the issue. I fully agree with Mr Michnik, who said there is no basis for fostering anti-Soviet demagogy in Poland at the present time.

Paradoxically, one can also see there being a positive aspect to anti-Sovietism. That is to say, one has to try to understand what elements of what sounds like criticism of the USSR actually serve the interests of the Soviet Union itself.

So, if a group of students holds a patently anti-Soviet demonstration outside the Soviet Embassy, I feel like saying: Why are you shouting all these slogans? Come in, take a seat, and let us have a talk. Let us assess and explain those issues that there are and that upset you.

When I read an article that is critical of the USSR, I always try to understand what the author is concerned about. If he is trying to improve relations with the USSR, I try to draw some conclusions from the article.

[Rudzinski] You would surely agree that certain areas in our common history, which have not been properly explained or assessed to date, serve to fuel the most emotional and blind anti-Soviet slogans. As someone who has been an observer of the Polish scene for many years, you are well aware of what Katyn means to the Poles. Why has there been no full explanation of the issue so far?

[Oskin] Before I answer your question, I would like to ask you whether you realize that anti-Polish incidents, which have historical roots, occur in the Soviet Union?

[Rudzinski] I do, although little is written about them in our press.

[Oskin] Although we have had a complicated common history, I think that there are no problems today, not even the Katyn tragedy, that provide a reason for sowing hostility and hatred. Hostility on the part of one side elicits a similar reaction from the other side. I believe that recalling and preserving hostile relations is a road leading to disaster.

You mentioned the Katyn issue. I think that it is one of several blank spots in Polish-Soviet relations. There are thousands of blank spots of this kind in the history of the Soviet people. I carefully read everything that is written on the subject of Katyn on both sides of the Bug. I am pleased that articles expressing different viewpoints have started appearing in the Soviet Union. The Polish-Soviet historians commissions has not produced any clear-cut statements on the question to date. I think that that is the commission's fault, and that of the Soviet side in particular.

As for my personal opinion, I think that the Katyn tragedy should be viewed in the context of the historical period in which it occurred. Millions of Soviet citizens were being murdered at that time. They included communists, officers, and marshals of the Soviet Union. Viewed from the angle of the logic of Stalinist crimes, I think that the liquidation of 10,000-20,000 officers belonging to a country with which the USSR was not—there is no reason to conceal this—on the best of terms would not have posed a moral dilemma for Stalin and his entourage, and Beria in particular. So, viewed from the angle of logic, it could have been a Stalinist crime, but, and I repeat, the Soviet Union still has no official position on this issue. However, it should be said that the present Soviet authorities have rigorously condemned and completely broken with the criminal practices of Stalinism.

[Rudzinski] Let us hope that we will soon receive the official version of the tragedy. However, there is still the problem of all the other crimes that were committed against Polish citizens who found themselves on territory that was incorporated into the USSR after 17 September 1939. Can we expect the persons who were responsible for the crimes that were committed against these people to be punished? Can those who survived the repressions and the illegal acts expect compensation and damages?

[Oskin] We receive many letters on this subject. The problem is that we cannot take any concrete action until a register is drawn up of the actions taken at that time that can be the subject of legal proceedings, and until the extent to which the actions were illegal is determined. The point is that the legal norms that were in force in the Soviet Union were applied in the territories that we are talking about. That was the situation at that time.

As for finding those responsible for the crimes, that is a complex and difficult problem that has many legal, moral, and political aspects. I think that our countries should reach an agreement at the governmental level on the question of compensation for those persons who suffered injustices as a result of this tragedy.

[Rudzinski] Let us return to the present. How would one define the Soviet sphere of interest in Poland at the present time? Is it determined by security issues, ideology, or economics?

[Oskin] Above all, Poland is a very interesting economic partner and one with a lot of potential. This is particularly true of the republics that are close to the border with Poland. We are interested in developing cooperation in electrical engineering, the manufacture of machinery for use in heavy industry, and the production of consumer goods. Polish science and culture are renowned for their achievements all over the world. That is why we are keen to cooperate in these areas. Unfortunately, there are still certain obstacles to the development of our cooperation. Economic relations between the USSR and Poland have not had a balanced character so far.

As for relations other than economic ones, it should be said that the Polish political reform and the development of a Polish model of socialism represent a very interesting experience for us. We hope that contacts between our countries will be deepened in all areas. As we are on the subject of friendly relations between our countries and peoples, I think that there should be an increase in direct contacts between members of religions, veterans, and representatives of various political tendencies and youth organizations.

[Rudzinski] Of course, one can envisage the development of organizational contacts, but, as examples from other parts of the world indicate, open borders and free travel are the best means of promoting mutual understanding and the development of good relations between neighbors. However, we have not noted any progress in this area.

[Oskin] I also think that our future lies in open borders. I think that the elimination of borders is linked to the level of sociopolitical development in individual countries. Unfortunately, the political, economic, and social conditions that exist at the present time do not permit the Soviet Union to change the legal setup on our borders. However, it should also be said that we have started to liberalize current regulations. For example, a Soviet citizen no longer needs a passport to travel to Poland, but can do so using his identification papers. Some customs regulations have been fully liberalized recently. Unfortunately, we are still not ready for the complete elimination of customs tariffs and borders. Besides, we are surely not the only state in this position.

[Rudzinski] Does this mean that nothing can be done straightaway in the so-called minor tourism area, that is, travel in the border areas, contacts with Poles living in adjacent republics?

[Oskin] We are prepared to make things much easier for the development of contacts for those groups in Soviet society that have special links with Poland.

We see no obstacles to this, other than economic ones. We simply have to develop the tourism infrastructure: hotels, catering facilities on both sides of the border. Two years ago all restrictions were lifted in the Soviet Union on visits to family or friends on the basis of invitations. The only condition is that the person extending the invitation has to assume responsibility for all the costs involved in maintaining his guest.

[Rudzinski] It will soon be 1 November. Will the relatives and friends of those who are buried in the Soviet Union be able to visit their graves this year?

[Oskin] The 1 November holiday is a very interesting and beautiful Polish tradition. I hope that one day the Soviet people will also have a day on which to remember their dead.

As for travel to graves in the Soviet Union, we do not envisage any form of organized travel this year. I think that preparations would have to be made in advance and a structure dealing with such travel would have to be set up. I very much liked the suggestion made by the author of the article "Let Us Talk About Friendship," which appeared in GAZETA WYBORCZA. He raised the very serious question of youth organizations assuming the task of tending war graves. I think that the proposal stands every chance of being realized.

More than 4 million Soviet prisoners of war passed through Poland during World War II. Every third one of them perished in a Nazi concentration camp. It should be noted that, when there was a negative attitude toward prisoners of war in our country and efforts were made to obliterate the memory of the 1,500,000 Soviet citizens who were buried in your country—that was under Stalin and later—the Poles tended their graves. It was an act of great compassion. We thank the thousands of scouts, veterans, and people of goodwill who helped. I would like Soviet citizens, organizations, and pioneers to lay flowers and light candles at those Polish graves in our country that Polish relatives cannot visit.

This year I will take part in official ceremonies to mark 1 November, just as I did last year. I would like to go to the Powazowski Cemetery, and I think that I will place my candle at the symbolic Katyn grave this year.

[Rudzinski] Detente in East-West relations, Gorbachev's policy of "new thinking" and the events in Eastern Europe and the GDR have caused the German question to be raised once again in many circles. How does the USSR view the unification of Europe from the angle of the unification of Germany?

[Oskin] I am not an expert on German issues, but Mikhail Gorbachev said very clearly in Berlin that all issues concerning the GDR are the internal affairs of that country. In my opinion, the unification of the two German states, which is being talked about by representatives of the FRG, is first and foremost a problem that lies within the sphere of competence of the two German states. If these two states want to find other forms of cooperation in the future that is their affair. I think that cooperation among and the union of all the countries of Europe should serve the interests of peace, security, and confidence on the continent.

[Rudzinski] The trend toward unification. M. Gorbachev's enormously successful visit to the FRG, and Kohl's visit to Moscow have prompted fears in a part of Polish society about a possible resumption of the Russian-German alliance which, historically, has always been existed at Poland's expense.

[Oskin] I categorically reject this view of our relations with the two German states. The view is a stereotype, according to which the past should continually influence the present. We would never wish to develop our contacts with any state at the expense of another state. We have repeated on many occasions that we are interested in seeing Poland become a strong and prosperous state. That lies in our interest.

[Rudzinski] As part of efforts to reduce tension on the continent, the Soviet Union has proposed withdrawing all foreign forces from the countries of Europe. When might that proposal bear fruit in the form of the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland?

[Oskin] A date for the complete withdrawal of Soviet forces in Poland will be the result of decisions made by the governments of our two countries. We have already reduced levels in all the socialist countries in which our forces are stationed. This also applies to Polish territory.

After World War II, the presence of our forces in Poland was one of the elements that defined the arrangement of forces in Europe. For a long time, our forces, which never interfered in Poland's internal affairs and at no time went beyond the gates of their bases, performed tasks connected with the preservation of peace and security in Europe. This was in keeping with the treaty that was concluded by our governments.

There will be less and less of a need for Soviet forces to be present in Poland as peace and confidence grow stronger and change in the political climate continues. I personally favor the removal of our units from Poland as quickly as possible.

[Rudzinski] I think that this is one more blank spot that has to be explained because, according to reliable Polish sources, there were situations in which Soviet forces did leave their bases. However, I would like to ask you about something entirely different. CEMA is disintegrating before our very eyes. What is the USSR's position on this? Should one abandon the idea of socialist integration, or would it appear that CEMA can still be rescued?

[Oskin] On the one hand, I agree that CEMA cooperation is far from perfect, and that is why we are seeking to change the mechanisms that are in force within the organization. On the other hand, we think that relations between CEMA and the EEC, and bilateral relations should be developed. For example, both Poland and the USSR maintain relations with Western European states, but we also have obligations stemming from our membership of CEMA.

Poland's debts with the USSR amount to $1.6 billion and about R6.5 billion. It is a large debt, but our government has understood Poland's difficult situation and has decided to postpone repayment of the dollar debt for 10 years.

The USSR is also pleased that many Western governments are considering aid projects for Poland. I read with interest that some states are earmarking sums of $10, $15, or $100 million for Poland, and I think that the Soviet example regarding the treatment of Poland's debt could have been a good sign in that respect.

Apart from that, I think that something that points to the development of our relations is the fact the Soviet Union is discharging its obligations toward Poland regarding the supply of raw materials, crude oil, cotton, and so on. Some specialists estimate that the cost of importing these products from the West would amount to an additional $3 billion or so.

This is one example of cooperation between our countries that can also be viewed within the context of CEMA.

[Rudzinski] Our countries are experiencing similar problems in many respects—economic problems, for example—but there is also hope. Do you think that this affects Poles' attitudes toward the USSR?

[Oskin] First, I have sensed a more favorable attitude toward the USSR among my friends as well as in my contacts with students, from whom I have sometimes received very harsh questions.

Recently, a cabdriver told me that there are only two people about whom no one says anything bad in Poland: the pope and Gorbachev. It was a friendly joke. Apart from that, an acquaintance of mine pointed out that the song "Mikhail, Mikhail" is only the second song to have praised a Soviet leader; Stalin was the only other leader to have been praised in this way.

On the other hand, there is clear concern and anxiety about whether we will succeed in implementing perestroyka. Poles who think, clearly realize that we will always be neighbors and that the success of the changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union will have an impact on the course of events in Poland in the same way as the success of the changes in Poland will affect the USSR.

As for the mood in Poland, there is surely no person nor any political force that is not pinning hopes on the Mazowiecki government. However, people are concerned about economic problems and the price increases. There is some basis for the joke that if you buy two eggs, the second one is more expensive than the first. There is also a lot of discussion among my friends on the subject of the distribution of political forces. Views differ. Some are pleased, and others think that it is a mistake, but the whole debate takes place on an appropriate level.

The Poles, all Poland, and all the political organizations and forces have grown much more mature since 1981. New standards of political debate, dialogue, and debate have emerged. I think that this Polish experiment has a significance that extends well beyond Poland's borders.

[Rudzinski] Thank you.

PZPR Commission Cited on Economic Program

PM3110101089 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 29 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Fears for the Future"]

[Text] An evaluation of the state of the Polish economy against the background of the government economic program is contained in a document prepared for discussion in the Polish Sejm by the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] Central Committee commission for socioeconomic policy.

The Polish economy, the document says, has entered a stage of hyperinflation. The spiral of increasing prices and incomes is climbing more and more vigorously. Labor incentives are disappearing. In many sectors of production, output is declining. The country faces a prospect of profound regression in the sphere of material production. Large social groups lack money for basic food products; at the same time enclaves of speculation are growing rapidly. Fears for the future are increasing.

Not even massive foreign aid can alleviate the situation, the commission notes. One can hardly be satisfied with the general assertion made in the government program that these trends will be reversed in future as a result of the beneficial effects of the market.

The further deterioration in the economic situation could cause a trend toward mutual accusations and demagoguery, which would be dangerous not only for the idea of national consensus, but first and foremost for Poland.

At the same time the document notes many positive aspects of the government program. The commission particularly supports the government's desire to normalize the financial system, limit and then eliminate the budget deficit, and gradually introduce a convertible zloty. At the same time this program prompts many significant criticisms and doubts. Thus the program is based on a kind of creed to the effect that total liberalization and a free market will resolve all economic problems. In the commission's opinion, taking into account the real conditions in the country, state intervention, where it is necessary, should not be renounced.

The PZPR Central Committee commission proposed that the PZPR deputies' club put forward an initiative on holding an in-depth discussion in the Sejm on the economic program proposed by the government.

Soviet, Polish Deputy Premiers View Trade Outlook

PM3010142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Prospects for Cooperation"]

[Text] L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received L. Balcerowicz, deputy chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, 26 October.

During the discussion current questions of and prospects for Soviet-Polish trade and economic relations were examined.

Criticism of CEMA 'Fully Justified'

LD2810053989 Warsaw PAP in English 2232 GMT 27 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct. 27—Vice-Premier Leszek Balcerowicz heading a Polish delegation to the 132nd meeting of the CMEA [CEMA] Executive Committee told PAP and the government daily RZECZPOSPOLITA about the situation within the CMEA and his talks with Soviet partners. Excerpts:

"I think that the criticism of CMEA is fully justified. While basing on hitherto observations, I can say that many postulates calling for reforming the mechanisms of cooperation within the framework of the council, motions formulated already in the 1960's when the so-called comprehensive programme was outlined, are still topical. In this respect, there has been a discrepancy of stances between various groups of countries. On the one hand there is Poland and Hungary and to certain degree also the USSR, and on the other hand, there are far more conservative countries. There is no agreement as to how far we can go in striving for market mechanism of cooperation.

"The point is also in answering the question whether this cooperation is to have a centralized character, that is, when decisions concerning trade, prices, terms of payments are made at the high level or whether we adopt a different mechanism, closer to that binding in the West."

Asked to assess meetings with Soviet Vice-Premiers Lev Voronin, L. Abalkin, and Ivan Silayev and also with Minister of Finance V. Pavlov, Balcerowicz said:

"We maintain our stand that the deliveries of Soviet raw materials in the next five years should be at the same level as in the current five-year period. We particularly mean here the deliveries of natural gas which according to hitherto Soviet proposals were to be considerably lower than we expected.

"As to the ruble debt which is now some 5.5 billion, I put forth a motion concerning the rescheduling of both the principal and interest payment until after 1995. As to the dollar debt, now woth some 1.5 billion, I forwarded a postulate that the terms of servicing the debt should not be worse than those awarded to us by the countries of the so-called Paris Club.

"Mechanisms of bilateral trade are another issue. To this effect I postulated to undertake joint work with a view to changing the mechanism so as to make it more compatible with the market economy we aim at in Poland, and—as it seems—so does the Soviet Union.

"Apart from these, I also referred to the matter of damages for Polish nationals for deportations, forced labour or expropriation after September 17, 1939, the issue which has already been undertaken by the Polish side. I also pointed out that it would be useful to examine and undertake appropriate solutions concerning economic conditions of stationing Soviet troops in Poland."

PZPR Strictures on Representation, Economy Noted

PM3010133189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Protecting Workers' Rights. Results of a Conference in the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee"]

[Text] Everything possible must be done to ensure that the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR], while adhering to the progressive left-wing traditions of the workers' movement, is a genuine party of economic and sociopolitical reforms and that formalism is finally eliminated from its day-to-day activity.

This was the unanimous opinion of participants in a conference of party committee secretaries from the country's 208 largest enterprises, held at the PZPR Central Committee.

Z. Sobotka, candidate member of the PZPR Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PZPR Central Committee Commission for Work with Working People, noted that the conference is one form of consultation on questions concerning preparations for the 11th party congress and on the current situation in party organizations at major industrial collectives, where activeness and the heat of pre-congress debates have been rising recently. Various party ideas clubs are operating in Warsaw, Gdansk, Wroclaw, Szczecin, and other cities. Points of view on necessary changes within the party are also expressed in letters and resolutions sent to the PZPR Central Committee. Taking account of the difficult situation in the country, many organizations are making serious criticisms and submitting proposals for stepping up party members' influence on the electoral process and the nomination of delegates to the 11th PZPR Congress.

The document adopted at the conference emphasizes that party organizations at enterprises advocate more effective protection of the political interests of the working class. We are resolutely against the predatory capitalism which could be built as a result of the transfer of public property to foreign capital and through the recently increased number of large fortunes acquired by speculative means, the representatives of Poland's largest workers party organizations declare in the document. We wish to see an organization of state and society whereby the ideals expressed in workers' protests will materialize in real life.

Working people are painfully affected by the further decline of living standards, the document says. The poorest strata of the population lack sufficient money for basic foodstuffs, while the rich do their shopping in foreign currency stores. What is needed is a government social policy which respects a person's right to a enjoy a certain social minimum.

Future Direction of Polish Foreign Policy Viewed

LD2710203689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 27 Oct 89

[From the "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] [Surguchev] Why did Jaruzelski permit counterrevolution to come to power in Poland? Gorbachev will surely not allow that capitalism be restored in Poland, that it leave the Warsaw pact, and that a state hostile to us be formed on the USSR's western border. These are the questions put in a letter by Valeriy Ivanovich Karskov from Novosibirsk. In response, I should first and foremost remind our esteemed listener that Poland is an independent state which is friendly towards us and its fate is determined by the Polish people themselves. Therefore with regard to the Polish people, it is absolutely out of place and disrespectful to say what can or cannot be permitted by the Soviet Union. Our country does not interfere and does not intend to interfere in the internal affairs of Poland or in the internal affairs of any other country. Of course, while military confrontation between the west and the easts, the USSR is forced to be concerned about the maintenance of the balance of strength, about ensuring security for itself and its allies, among which is, incidentally, the Polish People's Republic. So in this respect the two states have common interests. And the events that have occurred in Poland of late do not provide ground for speaking about its exit from the Warsaw Pact and its turning into a state hostile towards us.

The friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union, the membership of the Warsaw Pact—as pointed out by the representatives of the new Polish Government—remain one of the key directions of Polish foreign policy. This was also confirmed by the working visit of Comrade Shevardnadze to Warsaw, which has only just taken place. The new government headed by Mazowiecki was formed by Solidarnosc, as is known, on the basis of the results of free democratic elections which were held in the country and in which, this opposition movement achieved an indisputable success. It is perhaps regrettable that the Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] lost the position of the leading party, but Solidarnosc came to power by right. And Comrade Karskov thinks that this is counterrevolution. Well, then, he is free to have his own view, but I do not agree with him. In my view, this is a real demonstration of political pluralism, that is of that principle which the PZPR itself is now lacking. Incidentally, its representatives and the members of the United Peasants' Democratic Party also became a part of Mazowiecki's cabinet. It is significant that all political forces represented in the Polish parliament have chosen the path of cooperation for the sake of bringing the country out from deep crisis. The way out of it—if one takes into consideration the socioeconomic aspect—is seen in Poland as a switch to the market economy. Claiming that this means the restoration of capitalism is hardly rightful. After all, the market can be socialist, too.

There are, indeed, supporters of capitalism in Solidarnosc ranks. But I do not think that they will be permitted to solve this question on behalf of all Polish people. The majority of Polish working people, it would appear, do not plan to renounce socialism. True, they want to see it in a renewed form.

SFRY's Loncar Arrives; Met by Shevardnadze

LD3010171889 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—At the invitation of the Soviet Government, Budimir Loncar, federal secretary for foreign affairs of Yugoslavia, arrived in Moscow today.

He was welcomed at the airport by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and other officials.

TANJUG on Loncar Arrival

LD3010205189 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1806 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 30 (TANJUG)—Yugoslav Foreign Secretary Budimir Loncar arrived in Moscow this evening on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Loncar and his host, Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, are expected to discuss political and economic bilateral relations and international topics, which have special importance since Yugoslavia chairs the Nonaligned Movement.

Informing about Loncar's visit, the daily IZVESTIYA says that the diplomatic career of the Yugoslav foreign secretary is closely linked to Yugoslavia's activities in the Nonaligned Movement. The daily also says that Loncar's visit will contribute to the further strengthening of friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

Loncar will be received by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev tomorrow afternoon. This will be the first meeting of a high Yugoslav official with Gorbachev after his highly successful visit to Yugoslavia in March last year.

Before leaving Moscow for Leningrad, Loncar will hold a news conference for Soviet and foreign reporters, and will also visit the "star city," where Soviet astronauts are trained.

During Loncar's visit, the two sides will sign an agreement on cultural cooperation and an agreement on the abolition of visas in Moscow.

CSSR Agency Cited on Foreign 'Provocateurs'

PM3010162189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 89 Second Edition p5

[TASS report: "CTK Report"]

[Text] Prague, 29 Oct—CTK has circulated an official report on violations of public order in Prague on the day of the 71st anniversary of the formation of the Czechoslovak state. Some 3,000 people gathered today in Prague's Vaclav Square and later in other areas of the city center. Among them were agents provocateurs from abroad. Their actions were observed by inhabitants and guests of Prague.

CTK reports that the participants in the antisocialist demonstrations did not respond to appeals to clear the square made by members of bodies responsible for keeping public order. On the contrary, the aggressiveness of the crowd increased. The report says that forces responsible for maintaining order peacefully moved the demonstrators out of Vaclav Square and the entire city center.

"Charter-77" and other illegal groups have called for the holding of various actions independent of the celebrations taking place in the country to mark the national day. They have done this with the aid of Western mass media—primarily the Radio Free Europe and Voice of America radio stations. The news agency points out that it is precisely these mass media that have contributed to the organization of unsanctioned actions by means of intensive propaganda activity. In their reports they have called for a "storm" and demanded the restoration of a bourgeois republic.

CTK believes that the aim of these actions is clear: to abuse the behests of 28 October 1918 and organize provocation and confrontation. In the course of instilling order, security organs arrested 120 people.

RUDE PRAVO Cited on Demonstration

LD3010130889 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] In Czechoslovakia 149 people who took part in a demonstration in Prague over the weekend will face charges for disrupting public order and constituting a social danger. The Czechoslovak Communist Party daily RUDE PRAVO has said 149 of the 355 protestors questioned by the police after the unsanctioned demonstration would face legal proceedings. Seven of the protestors and five police officers were slightly hurt in minor clashes during the demonstration but, according to RUDE PRAVO, no one was hospitalized. The demonstration on Sunday was timed to coincide with the 71st anniversary of the founding of the Czechoslovak state, but its main slogans were considered by the authorities as being antigovernment.

West Europe

Estonian Party Leader Talks With Koivisto

LD2610124589 Helsinki Domestic Service in Finnish 1000 GMT 26 Oct 89

[Text] The party leader of Estonia, Vayno Vyalyas, this morning visited President Mauno Koivisto. Of the talks, which took just under an hour, the first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party, Vyalyas, said:

[Vyalyas recording in Estonian heard in background] The party leader of Estonia, Vayno Vyalyas, discussed his meeting with President Koivisto. He said that during the meeting talks were held in a very friendly and mutually understanding spirit about a great many matters which are topical in Soviet-Finnish relations and also in relations between the two neighbors, Finland and Estonia.

On the question of possible development of relations and concrete measures connected to that, Estonian party leader Vyalyas said:

[Vyalyas recording in Estonian heard in background] Vyalyas said that the discussions took up many sorts of questions; economic, foreign policy, and cultural exchange issues. In that sense, a good basis has been created which, of course, will be continued in the context of the ministries responsible for the matter within the framework of Soviet-Finnish cooperation. The meeting started at 1030 and lasted about 45 minutes.

After meeting President Koivisto, party leader Vyalyas had to hurry to the Kalastajatorppa [restaurant and conference center where Gorbachev is meeting the leaders of Finnish industry].

Yakovlev Meets With Finnish Youths 27 Oct

PM3110123389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Together for Peace and Clean Environment"]

[Text] Helskinki, 27 Oct—A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, received representatives of Finnish youth organizations here today. They handed him a message to M.S. Gorbachev bearing thousands of signatures. The message notes that specific steps in the sphere of disarmament are possible and that weapons and violence have never provided a genuine solution to existing problems. The initiatives to establish nuclear-free zones in the North of Europe and in other areas will lead to effective steps on the road toward a nuclear-free world. However, weapons alone will not decide the future of our planet. Young Finnish people would like to embark on a joint quest with Soviet young people for solutions to the worsening ecological problems in the Baltic Sea, Kola Peninsula, and Karelia areas. The development of exchanges between our countries and youth tourism will contribute to the development of relations between our two states.

The guests expressed the hope that M.S. Gorbachev will by his concrete actions exert a positive influence on free, humanitarian cooperation and contacts between states and their citizens.

A.N. Yakovlev said in reply that people in the Soviet Union attached great importance to problems of disarmament and the preservation of the health of the planet, whose solution demands urgent actions. The current visit to Finland had laid a firm foundation for the establishement of an ecologically clean border between our countries, but much work lay ahead, and it would have to be done jointly. Young Soviet people were ready for cooperation.

Best wishes for Finnish young people's work to solve disarmament problems and ecological issues were conveyed on behalf of M.S. Gorbachev.

The conversation was attended by V.I. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee, and V.V. Zagladin, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman adviser.

PRAVDA Account of Shevardnadze-Sodano Talks

PM2310084589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
21 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Favor of Direct Dialogue"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, has received Archbishop A. Sodano, Vatican secretary for relations with states (head of the foreign policy department), who is in the Soviet Union as the personal representative of Pope John Paul II.

During the conversation, the two sides developed the ideas voiced by M.S. Gorbachev at his meeting with Vatican representatives by expressing interest in making fuller use of the possibilities of expanding mutual understanding and collaboration between the USSR and the Vatican within the framework of the all-European process and in international affairs in the interests of solving global problems.

The situation in Lebanon was discussed more specifically. It was noted that there are still reasons for concern, although encouraging signs have appeared recently—primarily the cease-fire. The two sides welcomed the Arab League Trilateral Committee initiatives, which aim to achieve by political means the kind of solutions that would ensure the peaceful, stable development of Lebanon as a sovereign, territorially integrated state, something which in turn would be in the interests of a lasting, just settlement in the Near East as a whole. As A. Sodano pointed out, the new Soviet political approaches—the essential thrust of which is to decisively make humane principles paramount in Soviet domestic and foreign policy—have the understanding and support of the Vatican.

During the conversation, the Vatican foreign policy department head touched on a number of issues concerned with the activity of the Catholic Church in the Soviet Union. In this connection, E.A. Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union is now actively engaged in forming a rule-of-law state. It is planned to adopt a law on freedom of conscience in religious organizations within the framework of this process. The corresponding draft law will be submitted for discussion to the USSR Supreme Soviet. Questions concerning the activity of various religious organizations on our country's territory will be regulated on the basis of this law and also with a mind to the pledges the Soviet Union has made under the Helsinki and Vienna accords.

The sides stressed their mutual interest in continuing contacts similar to today's and in developing a direct political dialogue between the USSR and the Vatican.

Karpov, Danish Delegation Meet on Disarmament

PM2610093389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
25 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Soviet-Danish consultations on problems of disarmament took place at the USSR Foreign Ministry 23 October. The Danish delegation was headed by J. Korsgaard-Pedersen, head of the Danish Foreign Ministry Disarmament Secretariat. The Soviet delegation was headed by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.P. Karpov.

Karpov, Swedish Ambassador Discuss Vienna Talks

LD2010215589 Moscow TASS in English 2036 GMT
20 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 20 TASS—Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov met Swedish Ambassador to the Soviet Union Carl Orjan Berner on Friday [20 October—FBIS] to discuss Vienna talks on conventional arms and confidence and security building in Europe, and other disarmament issues.

FRG Parliamentarian on Visit, Security Issues

PM2610154589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Oct 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent Nikolay Kalintsev report: "Sides Must Show Good Will"]

[Text] Bonn, 17 Oct—The meetings and talks we have had in Moscow have strengthened our optimism and our confidence that success will be achieved at the current disarmament talks, U. Ronneburger, deputy chairman of the Free Democratic Party [FDP] faction in the Bundestag, said at a press conference here. He was head of a delegation of this party's parliamentarians, which visited the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

En route to the Soviet Union, he said, the FDP parliamentarians had meetings in Vienna with the leaders of the delegations from the FRG, the United States, the Soviet Union, and some other countries at the talks on conventional forces and confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. On the basis of these meetings and also our conversations at the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Foreign Ministry and with Soviet military and political experts in Moscow, we can conclude that it will be possible to reach the first agreement on achieving stability on the continent in the conventional arms sphere as early as next year.

The parliamentarian went on to stress the urgent need for a universal ban on chemical weapons and the elimination of all stockpiles. We must work to ensure that the convention on banning these dangerous types of weapons is universal rather than bilateral.

The Soviet Union, he emphasized, has begun implementing specific measures in connection with the change in its military doctrine and the lending of a defensive nature to it. During the parliamentarians' visit to the M.V. Frunze Military Academy, they were able to see for themselves that defense rather than offense takes pride of place in the officers' training program.

Bid To Change West Berlin's 'Status' Hit

PM3110113189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Zyubanov "Rejoinder": "Heart of the Matter... "]

[Text] West Berlin—Political observers on the banks of the Spree are united in their opinion that the Social Democrat Walter Momper, governing mayor of West Berlin, is a person who generally holds progressive views. And even his unlawful election as chairman of the Bundesrat a few days from now will change nothing in that respect. The Bundesrat, as we know, is the name of the West German parliamentary chamber comprising representatives from the FRG laender.

But why, you ask, should Momper's forthcoming election be regarded as unlawful? Well, because West Berlin does not belong to the FRG, as is clearly pointed out in the 3 September 1971 four-power agreement that lays down the city's special political status. It is precisely for this reason that the four representatives of West Berlin in the FRG Bundesrat do not have voting rights.

But, according to the latest reports in the local press, W. Momper would like to change this provision and secure voting rights for West Berlin's representatives in the FRG Bundesrat. The heart of the matter, as the saying goes, is that this is an attempt to change the city's political status to a certain degree.

In a recent interview for West German radio, former Senator Scholz, who for a long time represented West Berlin in Bonn, directly warned his colleague W. Momper against such a breach of the city's status. "The provision about limiting the voting rights of West Berlin deputies," he stated, "is enshrined in the four-power agreement signed by the USSR, the United States, Great Britain, and France. This means that it is a part of this city's status, so we ought not to start disputing it in a frivolous fashion."

Good advice, Mr Momper, don't you agree?

Katushev Chairs USSR-UK Cooperation Session

PM2610153789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The 16th Session of the Soviet-British Standing Intergovernmental Commission on Scientific, Technical, Trade, and Economic Cooperation took place in Moscow 17-19 October under the chairmanship of K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of Foreign Economic Relations. The British delegation was headed by Lord Trefgarne, minister of state at the Department of Trade and Industry.

UK Labour Party's Current Popularity Examined

OW2710130089 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1120 GMT 25 Oct 89

[From the "World Today" program]

[Text] Very often, when British observers assess the popularity of Great Britain's two leading political parties—the Conservatives and Labour—they either exclaim: "What a shame elections cannot be not held tomorrow" or "It's good elections are not being held yet!" As far as sympathy toward either party is concerned, each party's popularity varies considerably during periods between elections.

There is a sufficiently long time until the next elections, which are planned for 1992. Any fan of Labour would say this is the right time to complain about elections not being held tomorrow. The fact is, Labour's popularity has reached its highest point since its main political rival, the Conservative Party, came to power.

The information service of a television company, (?ITV), conducted a special telephone poll among voters. Almost 53 percent favored Labour, while only 26 percent favored the Conservatives. One could conclude that, had the elections been held now, this would ensure a firm majority in Parliament for the present opposition.

The timing of this poll is not coincidental. Party conferences have been held recently. Both parties, the Conservatives and Labour, are trying to ensure the sympathies of the public. Political observers are not enchanted by these high figures of public sympathy for Labour. Many see the success of the opposition as merely the reverse side of the failure of the ruling Conservative Party. Consequently, the problem lies not so much in the increasing trust of the public in an alternative political line, but in the distrust of electors in the government's ability to ensure the progress of Great Britain in the current situation.

Compensation for UK's 'Guildford Four' Urged

PM3110102189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Respecting Human Rights"]

[Text] As has become known, Britain's legal organs the other day quashed the charges against the "Guildford Four," who had been convicted of carrying out acts of terrorism. In October 1975, Hill, Armstrong, Conlon, and Richardson were sentenced to life imprisonment, and now the verdict has been overturned. They have already been freed. However, the British law enforcement organs' mistake has been extremely costly. Innocent people have spent almost 15 years in jail.

Welcoming the release, the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation Commission for International Cooperation on Humanitarian Issues is backing the British public's fair demand that they be compensated. While condemning terrorism everywhere and in all its forms, the social commission's statement says, we are convinced that the fight against terrorism should be conducted within the law and be subordinate to the supreme values of the protection of individuals' rights.

CPSU Delegation Attends Irish CP Congress

PM3010133589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At Congress of Fraternal Party"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by M.A. Knyazyuk, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Ivanovo CPSU Oblast Committee, left Moscow for Dublin 26 October to take part in the 20th Communist Party of Ireland [CPI] Congress at the invitation of the CPI National Executive Committee.

CPSU Greetings

PM3110101189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Second Edition p 7

[Message of greetings from CPSU Central Committee to 20th Irish Communist Party Congress]

[Text] To the 20th Irish Communist Party Congress: Dear Comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends the delegates of the 20th Irish Communist Party Congress fraternal greetings and wishes for fruitful work.

The CPSU values highly the firm bonds of friendship and solidarity which link our parties and has profound respect for the Irish Communists.

Our crucial time presents all political parties and movements with complex new problems whose solution will determine not only the safeguarding of working people's everyday interests, but also the survival of civilization itself. The role of Communists' joint theoretical work, which, on a Marxist basis, is called upon to reveal the significance and content of the socialist prospect in the new conditions, is also growing.

We wish the fraternal Irish Communist Party success in the struggle for the interests of the Irish people and for peace, democracy, and socialism!

CPSU Central Committee.

French Communists Study CPSU Agrarian Policy

PM2610095789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "French Communists in USSR"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for party exchanges and cooperation between the CPSU and the French Communist Party [PCF], a PCF delegation headed by J.M. Langoureau, member of the PCF Central Committee, visited the USSR 15-20 October to familiarize itself with the CPSU's agrarian policy. The French comrades visited Moscow and Belgorod and took a trip around Moscow Oblast, had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Department, the Belgorod Oblast CPSU Committee, and the editorial office of the newspaper SELSKAYA ZHIZN, and visited food industry enterprises and a number of collective farms and state farms, where they familiarized themselves with economic and social processes of change in the countryside.

Voronin Talks With Turkish Finance Minister

PM2610155189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Oct 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Talks were held between L.A Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and E. Pakdemirli, Turkish minister of finance and customs, 18-19 October.

K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of Foreign Economic Relations, and S. Yurur, Turkish minister of industry and trade, took part in the talks.

Latin America & Caribbean

Ryzhkov Greets Soviet-Latin American Meeting

LD1110132489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1220 GMT 11 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 11 Oct (TASS)—A meeting of the Soviet and Latin American public organized by the Soviet Committee for Solidarity with Latin American Peoples opened here today.

A greeting from Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to the participants in the meeting was read. It states:

"I cordially greet the participants in the representative meeting, who have gathered in Moscow to discuss, within a framework of popular diplomacy, topical problems of strengthening cooperation between the Soviet Union and countries in Latin America in the spirit of the new political thinking.

"The public's role in asserting the principles of a nonviolent and nuclear-free world, of the democratization and humanization of international relations on the basis of the primacy of common human values, and of respect for the right of each people to freely choose their path of development, is greater than ever at the present stage, which is a turning-point.

"The positions of the Soviet Union and the Latin American countries are consonant or coincident on many important issues of strengthening peace and general security, of curbing the arms race, and of disarmament. The political relations between us have markedly expanded and deepened. At the same time, there are still considerable reserves within mutually advantageous and equal contacts in the economic, scientific-technical, and cultural spheres, and in all spheres of human contact.

"In recent years we have discovered extraordinary opportunities for closer and more productive mutual ties. I express confidence that your meeting will contribute to the materialization of these opportunities. I wish all the participants fruitful work for the good of the friendship between our peoples."

Expert Views Soviet Aid to Cuba, Nicaragua

PM2710140189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 89 p 3

[Interview with A.D. Bekarevich, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Latin America Institute, by correspondents S. Zavorotnyy and A. Teplyuk under the rubric "The World and Us": "Romance and Economic Accountability"; date, place not given; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] There is no denying that even people's deputies are inclined to believe that, by helping other countries, we alienate them from ourselves. Is this so? Our correspondents talk with A.D. Bekarevich, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Latin America Institute.

[Correspondents] The "blazing continent"—this is what Latin America was called until recently. As a rule, the distant South American countries appeared before us in the romantic aureole of the heroic exploits of Fidel Castro and his comrades. But the shots over the Moncada Barracks—the symbol of the Cuban revolution—have died away, and the armored personnel carriers in which the Nicaraguan rebels burst into Managua have been handed over to the museum. Looking around today, we will not see a second Che Guevara on the Latin American continent. It seems that romantic revolutionaries do not fit into present-day Latin America. On the crest of a political wave are pragmatic leaders who have succeeded in gaining the voters' trust with promises to improve their fellow citizens' living conditions...

[Bekarevich] I agree that in the sixties the example of Cuba was very infectious for close and distant neighbors. They tried to follow and imitate it. For the sake of a lofty idea Che Guevara traveled to Bolivia in the pious belief that his example and partisan courage would blow up that country from within and liberate it. In his soul he hoped for more—to set the whole of Latin America alight with the conflagration of revolution. Che's noble impulse ended in tragedy.

Time has put everything in its place in the affair of Che Guevara. However, some people in the West are still trying to cast a dark shadow on the bright image of the Argentine physician. The bold revolutionary is increasingly frequently being accused of being the father of the "theory of parasitism" of victorious revolutions in developing countries: For this the USSR is supposedly obliged to maintain them at its own expense...

Che Guevara was a revolutionary and a romantic, an unusual personality. He looked at many problems more from the viewpoint of morality, in the best sense of this word. Including in the matter of assisting victorious revolutions in underdeveloped countries. And it would be historically incorrect, if not to say dishonest, to judge him in such a cold and arrogant manner, from the vantage point of today and of experience. Would it not be better to learn from the experience of that remarkable man and to take from him and his generation everything that can help us in our difficult time?!

A revolution cannot do without romantics, but a revolution is not motivated by romanticism. Hopes for a better life lie at the basis of all revolutions. Otherwise, why are they made? The credit of popular trust has its limits. Only the revolution which succeeds, in the final analysis, in resolving economic and social problems will be able to survive. If a revolution fails to cope with this and is unable to prove its economic viability, then sooner or later it will vanish like water into sand...

[Correspondents] Does it not seem to you, Professor, that your arguments contain the key to the answer to the question of why the Popular Unity government fell in Chile in 1973? Your logic also contains grains of truth in the search for the answer to another question: Why did we spend 15 years burning Pinochet's effigy and making clenched-fist gestures of solidarity with the Chilean patriots' struggle, but the bloody dictator managed to hold on to the peak of power for so long? Did bayonets alone help him in this?

[Bekarevich] Indeed, the Popular Unity government fell not only as a result of CIA intrigues but because of its inability to resolve acute socioeconomic problems in time. As for Pinochet, you do not have to convince anyone that we were dealing with a regime of personal dictatorial power built on terror and violence. The military dictatorship in Chile modernized the economy in a brutal way, using draconian methods. More accurately, they simply farmed out the whole economy to multinational corporations and local entrepreneurs. They allocated to themselves the role of guarantor of political stability.

The middle class also benefited from modernization in Chile. It benefited economically, and Pinochet suited them to a certain extent. This is how the regime's social base, which has reconciled itself to dictatorship and enjoys the fruits of modernization, has shaped up. Should Latin America follow the Chilean prescription in resolving economic problems? Of course not. The social price is too great. I am sure that it is far more preferable and humane to modernize the economy under conditions of democracy.

[Correspondents] Let us return to the start of our conversation. It was not by chance that we mentioned Che Guevara. Western scientists and publicists have long been accusing Cuba of "economic freeloading." It has become a commonplace to claim that, according to CIA data, "the maintenance of Cuba costs the Soviet Union" $8 billion a year. They also talk of Nicaragua behind our back, claiming that we do not stint assistance there either. And yet it is an open secret that things are really bad in our own country...

[Bekarevich] The press has recently been discussing widely the question of whether economic aid should be given to developing countries and, if so, on what scale and in which forms. Data which have not been fully checked and are not totally reliable, like the CIA figure which you mentioned, are frequently cited in the polemic of arguments.

In reply to a question about what must be done to ensure that things go well in the state, Confucius once said: It is necessary to lend to words their true meaning. And that is what we must do—speak openly of the size of our aid to Cuba. What are we ashamed of? Who are we afraid of? Our assistance saved Cuba from the blockade. It enabled it to hold out, survive, and create the foundations of a modern economy. We can only be proud of that.

Yes, our aid was considerable: Approximately 460 national economic projects alone were constructed during the years of cooperation. As regards the present day, the Soviet Union meets Cuba's needs for oil and petroleum products by 100 percent, for fertilizers by 91 percent, for rolled ferrous and nonferrous metals by 70 percent, for grain crops by 94 percent, and for trucks and passenger cars by 70 percent. The sum total of credits between 1960 and the present amounts to R6 billion. Additional long-term targeted credit was granted to Cuba for 1986-1990 to the tune of R2.5 billion.

Today we are giving Cuba technical assistance in the construction of 174 industrial projects. These include a nuclear power station, a thermal power station, a nickel plant, a large-capacity oil base with wharves and pipelines, and so forth.

We have also given Nicaragua substantial assistance. During 1981 through 1985 alone we supplied that country gratis with 159,000 tonnes of grain and 57,000 tonnes of rice worth more than $100 million. We virtually met Nicaragua's oil needs, by supplying it with 754,000 tonnes of oil during 1985-1986 and approximately 1 million tonnes during 1987-1988.

It is possible to say without exaggeration that assistance both from the Soviet Union and from other countries friendly toward Nicaragua has helped that distant Central American country to hold out under the conditions of the trade blockade declared against it by the United States. For the future I favor an open discussion in parliament of the size of the aid and the state of our foreign trade. Whether it is a question of Cuba, Nicaragua, or some other country.

[Correspondents] It is hard to disagree with you. And yet in 30 years we have never managed to balance our trade with Cuba. Today the Cubans owe us for goods worth R2,386,000,000. It seems to us that trade with Nicaragua also needs a certain correction. Last year we supplied it with goods worth R274 million, while exports from that country to the USSR totaled just R2 million. We realize that in the past both Cuba and Nicaragua needed our assistance. Today the situation in that part of the world is changing. Tension is declining, in particular, around Nicaragua...

[Text] [Bekarevich] Trade has always been a unique barometer of the general state of affairs. In this case we have inherited the trade imbalances with Cuba and Nicaragua to a certain extent from complex times. Today we should put our trade relations with those countries on a footing of mutual advantage, not curtail or abandon them altogether, as certain people urge.

In the past we really did not always determine correctly the size of aid or its channels. Then we were helping Cuba to survive, as we are doing today in Nicaragua.

You can also frequently hear rebukes that, by supplying Cuba with oil, for example, we lose currency, because petroleum products could be sold on the free market. But Cuba supplies us with commodities which our country would have to pay currency to acquire. I mean citrus fruits, sugar, and nickel. Cuban deliveries meet 40 percent of our needs for oranges and lemons, 30 percent with regard to sugar, and approximately 20 percent for cobalt and nickel ores.

[Correspondents] Today the whole country is going over to economic accountability. We do not know whether Foreign Ministry staffers will agree with us, but this process probably will not bypass our foreign policy. Speaking of trade, it seems to us that it must be carried on even with our close partners on mutually advantageous terms. To judge from your books, Professor, you were calling for this back in the seventies, insisting, in particular, on the introduction of scientifically substantiated prices, not preferential prices, on the socialist market for both exported and imported goods. But, as is known, nothing came of that...

[Bekarevich] Unfortunately, scientists still remain just scientists—their recommendations might be heeded, or they might be ignored. This was the case in the recent past. It must not be the case today.

I see the instilling of order in the sphere of export-import prices as the key to the qualitative improvement of our trade and economic relations. We must jointly seek to strengthen healthy trends in the economies of both Cuba and the USSR and deepen our cooperation on this basis.

[Correspondents] But, alas, the ration system is a reality of Cuba today...

[Bekarevich] Let's not be mistaken. Ration cards are still a necessity in Cuba. The Cubans themselves are in no hurry to abolish them. Cards guarantee the essentials for everyone. This is important for badly-off and large families.

[Correspondents] If we have understood you correctly, you are even recommending that we learn from Cuba...

[Bekarevich] Well, under conditions of an economy suffering from shortages it is better for everyone to have something than nothing. Bear in mind that an economy of shortages dictates its own distribution mechanism.

[Correspondents] In their search for a way out of serious economic problems many Latin Americans are turning their gaze in earnest toward... drugs. It is known that the fathers of the Bolivian mafia promised to pay off the country's entire foreign debt in the space of a few years in exchange for the legalization of their activities...

[Bekarevich] Drug production has now become a substantial informal part of national economies in latin America. The income from drugs produced on the basis of Bolivian raw materials totals $3-5 billion a year. That country's exports, for example, total just $450 million, and imports $650 million. In other words, the income from the drugs business is 3-5 times greater than the country's entire commodity turnover, and yet Bolivia's foreign debt totaled $3.9 billion in 1988. It is no coincidence that the Bolivian mafia has repeatedly proposed paying off the country's entire foreign debt in exchange for the legalization of its activities. The leaders of the Colombian mafia have also expressed themselves in the same spirit. And this with the country's foreign debt standing at almost $16 billion. It is very complex to fight drugs production, since there is a vast market—the United States. And, as is known, demand creates supply. And then the drugs business makes a net profit of 30,000-40,000 percent. Can any force stop the drugs mafia on the way to this goal?

[Correspondents] Assessing the situation in Latin America as a whole, Americans see just one way out of the economic and political crisis situation for all the countries of the region: a multiparty system, the establishment of a market economy, the country's democratization. And they relate "this" primarily to Nicaragua...

[Bekarevich] The Americans take a parochial view of all this. But under the conditions of Latin American countries, which are mainly backward and underdeveloped, such as Nicaragua, it is first necessary to mobilize all national forces, rally them around the task of reviving the country, and take the path of harmonizing the interests of all sections. In particular, the chief thing for Nicaragua today is to strengthen the mixed sector of the economy and political pluralism.

There is no other way to stabilize the situation in that country. Of course, the war against counterrevolution slowed down and in some cases halted the inevitable process of political and economic democratization in Nicaragua. Therefore today, when the situation around Nicaragua has changed, that country needs real political pluralism and a real mixed economy.

[Correspondents] U.S. political experts like to discuss "zones of influence" between the USSR and the United States: They frequently refer to Nicaragua and Cuba, which have supposedly moved into "the orbit of Soviet influence..."

[Bekarevich] We do not seek zones of influence in Central America. As for Cuba, the historically evolved relations with that country naturally have their own specific features.

However, the practice of "special" relations with Cuba should not be understood as anybody's monopoly on these relations. On the contrary, Cuba seeks to diversify its ties with the whole world, including the United States. I believe that in time, when the stereotypes of thinking with regard to the world's division into spheres of influence have receded into the past, when the Americans have understood that we were not seeking and do not seek to turn Cuba into our "unsinkable aircraft carrier," and when the fears inspired by the images of "enemies and allies" of the cold war times have been dispelled, then the United States will undertake to normalize its relations with Cuba.

But for the time being Washington adheres to the old policy of pressuring and isolating Cuba. It still hopes to change the political system.

[Correspondents] But the image of the enemy is tenacious in Cuba, too...

[Bekarevich] Could it really be otherwise after so many years of blockade and isolation? I am sure that the new political thinking is helping us to understand the worthlessness of the old concepts of developing our relations without fail to someone's detriment. It is time we all buried the theory of a "bipolar world."

[Correspondents] Readers get the impression that only Cuba and Nicaragua in Latin America are of interest to us, the USSR. Is that so?

[Bekarevich] I disagree. The USSR has formed stable, friendly relations with Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, and other countries, which will, I believe be broadened and deepened in the future.

I believe there is a basis for this. Latin American countries have become an important factor in foreign policy. Without regard for this factor it is impossible to resolve many complex problems under discussion, in particular, at the United Nations. Argentina and Mexico, for example, are active members of the "Delhi Six," which advocate a ban on tests of nuclear weapons and a reduction in their arsenals in the world.

There are also economic factors for our country's rapprochement with Latin America. Like those countries, we are going through a period of economic upheaval today. We have considerable reserves in this sphere...

[Correspondents] However, representatives of Latin American business circles can frequently be heard saying that it would be better for the USSR not to develop trade and economic ties with Latin America, for this affects the USSR's prestige—this is falling because of the bad quality of the goods supplied, failure to observe all conditions, and so forth.

[Bekarevich] I disagree with them. I believe that we have today faced up to the problem of the quality of our output. The international market is teaching us how to trade and produce. We have tackled this in earnest. Therefore in this sense we have become partners with Latin America... in restructuring our economies.

Perestroyka gives us all an opportunity for real changes both in our economy and in our economic relations with Latin America. It is our task not to miss this opportunity. A joint task, for inefficient economies which suffer from shortages cannot be the basis for efficient economic cooperation.

Supreme Soviet Session

Gorbachev Opens 30 Oct Supreme Soviet

LD3110110689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Introductory remarks by Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, at joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities in the Kremlin on 30 October—recorded]

[Text] Good day, comrades. I ask the members of the Supreme Soviet to register themselves. [pause for registration] Four hundred forty-one delegates, members of the Supreme Soviet. I declare the joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities open.

Comrades, as we agree, today we are beginning and are devoting time at the beginning of the week to a discussion of the state plan for economic and social development and the state budget for 1990. I ask you, before getting down to work and giving the floor to comrades for reports, to pay attention to the draft plan which has been distributed. Please study it attentively, those who have not done so, since it contains outline proposals up to 24 November, over a longer term, so to speak, in order for us to plan our work, already foreseeing the congress on the horizon. And then, during the course of the day we will find time to exchange views on this issue. Are there no objections? Good.

Comrades, the committees and the commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have concluded their examination of the plan and budget for 1990 and have prepared corresponding conclusions. In this regard it is proposed that the chairmen of the commissions, comrades Kucherenko and comrades Vilkas, and comrade Vilkas [as heard] be given the floor, and then we will listen to comrades Voronin's and Pavlov's statements. What do you think? Is that acceptable?

Supreme Soviet Discusses State Plan, Budget

LD3010163389 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Final hearings on drafts of a state plan and a budget of the country for 1990 began in the Soviet parliament today.

The documents have been under scrutiny in parliamentary committees and commissions for just over six weeks.

The draft plan and budget are a move towards social reorientation of the economy, said Victor Kucherenko, chairman of the Council of the Union's Planning and Budgetary-and-Finance Commission, in his remarks at the session.

Specifically, real incomes of the population are expected to grow by 5.8 percent, and it has been suggested to re-channel 15 billion roubles from production accumulation to current consumption and non- industrial construction.

While discussing the plan and budget, deputies pointed out that the documents are not free from old sterotypes and even suggested referring them back to the government for additional elaboration, Kucherenko said.

However, a well-considered approach to actual economic resources prevailed, he added.

Kucherenko voiced conviction that additional resources for the development of the social sphere should be sought in increasing the budget revenue resultant of latent reserves and a rise in the efficiency of economic management, and not in redistributing limited budget funds.

The draft state plan determines measures to extend the rights of the union republics and enterprises, said Eduardas Vilkas, chairman of the Council of Nationalities' Commission for the Social and Economic Development of the Union and Autonomous REpublics and Autonomous Regions and Districts.

The number of directively set indices will be cut, and planning of the production of consumer goods, retail trade, the paid services to the population, and the development of the material basis of the social sphere are being brought under the republics' authority, Vilkas said.

At the same time he drew attention to the lack of material and technical support for many planned targets.

Deputy Premier Lev Voronin told deputies that, in finalising the plan, the government had given special attention to the social programme for 1990.

He said it had accommodated the deputies' proposal for a 3.6 billion rouble increase in appropriations for the social sphere by tapping extra sources of budget revenues.

Outlays to raise the living standards of the people in 1990 will be 40 percent more than previously planned.

Heeding the deputies' opinion, the Council of Ministers intends, in preparing the plan for conversion of defence industry, to stimulate increased output by defence factories of sophisticated civilian products, including planes, vessels, household appliances and ecologically pure power plants.

In 1990 civilian products will account for 50 percent of the defence industry's overall output.

Since deputies, during the discussion of the plan in the committees and commissions, pointed to the insufficient resourcing of the plan, Voronin told them of a government decision to allow a 650 million rouble increase in the purchase of some raw materials abroad.

Oil exports will be slashed by 3.8 million tonnes which will go to meet the needs of national economy.

Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov proposed that the national budget for 1990 be approved with a deficit of 59.2 billion roubles.

He rejected proposals for another 47 billion rouble increase in social spending favoured by some of the committees and commissions, arguing that it was practically impossible to implement these proposals in the present economic situation.

Pavlov drew deputies' attention to the fact that the performance of many sectors and regions had largely offset the measures taken to improve the financial situation.

Strikes and inter-ethnic strife have affected the overall economic performance of the USSR. The state of finances has especialy deteriorated.

The parliament then discussed the draft plan and draft budget.

Further on Budget Discussion

LD3010180289 Moscow TASS in English 1744 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 30 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet parliament today embarked on a final hearing on the draft plan and budget of the country for 1990.

The drafts have already been discussed in the committees and commissions for one and a half months.

The deputies on the whole supported the government proposals to approve the revised drafts.

Many commented on their new "philosophy": For the first time the USSR is giving up the sacred principle of planning the growth of gross indicators.

The economic and financial targets for next year are aimed at halting further deterioration of the economic indicators.

Many speakers today focused on the country's finances. Economist Shmeliyov (Moscow) described the government's proposed figures for money emission (10 billion roubles) and the budget deficit (59.2 billion roubles) as excessive.

In Shmeliyov's opinion it is possible to save on subsidies for rural farms operating at loss and assistance to developing countries.

Deputy Aleksandr Orlov from Chelyabinsk called the plan and the budget practicable, despite being at the limit of the country's possibilities.

He had critical words for the "charity-begins-at-home" demands of many parliamentary bodies to increase budget appropriations for the development of "their own" economic sectors, stressing that these demands, if met, can only exacerbate the imbalances in the economy.

The discussion of the drafts will continue on Tuesday.

Report on Kucherenko Speech

LD3010224689

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1604 GMT on 30 October, during the recorded relay of the 30 October Supreme Soviet session, broadcasts a 61-minute speech by Viktor Grigoryevich Kucherenko, chairman of the Commission for Planning, Budget, and Finance of the Soviet of the Union.

Kucherenko begins his address by saying: "Esteemed comrade deputies!

"Today we are summing up the results of 6 weeks' work by the commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet to examine the draft state plan for the economic and social development of the USSR, the draft budget for 1990, and the fulfillment of the USSR state budget for 1988. The conclusions of the committees and commissions have been passed to you; I shall merely dwell briefly on certain points in them.

"Carrying out the Supreme Soviet's instructions, the deputies approached the examination of documents submitted by the government with an awareness of responsibility that was determined by the complexity of the country's economic situation, and the unresolved nature of many social, economic, political, and ethnic problems. For this reason the debates in the commissions and committees proceeded in a very urgent but businesslike manner." Kucherenko goes on to point out that the critical state of the country's finance had affected the discussion. The deputies tried to avoid exceeding the budget deficit and currency issue which had already been set out. He continued:

"In the process of examining the plan and budget in the commissions and committees, the deputies stressed that the concept for developing a plan and budget for 1990 is not free of existing stereotypes. Gosplan [State Planning Committee] functionaries agreed with the deputies that to a certain extent this is a consequence of the fact that the laws currently being considered by the Supreme Soviet—on ownership, leasing, land, taxation, republican financial autonomy, and local self-government,—were somewhat late by the time the plan started to be developed, and it was not possible to take them fully into account in the formation of indices for the plan and budget."

Kucherenko adds that for this reason the 1990 plan is a transitional stage. The new principles will be fully implemented when the plan for the 13th 5-year plan is being worked out.

Regional interests often gained the upper hand over the state's approach in committee debates. Not many people proposed ways of increasing the USSR's gross national product, Kucherenko notes. Acceptable options were agreed on in the finalized draft plan, options which would ensure that the set targets are realistic and feasible. However, Kucherenko adds that the deputies indicated that if the country's resources and forces were not mobilized to a greater extent than in past years, there would be no quick solution to the current situation.

Measures to consolidate the material and technical basis of the health service were also reflected in the plan, said Kucherenko. "For these purposes a capital investment of R4.1 billion is stipulated, which is R1.3 billion higher than that of the 5-year plan. In 1990 the total amount of hospitals, outpatient, and polyclinic establishments will constitute 78,500 beds and polyclinics handling 201,000 outpatient visits per shift." Over and above the sum allocated to developing health care in the budget, it is proposed to assign another R1.7 billion; R380 million of this for the production of medicine and R1.3 billion to the upkeep of medical institutions. [figures as heard]

The deputies are concerned by the low volumes for the commissioning of pre-school establishments; these are lower than the volumes set out in previous decisions, Kucherenko explains. The conclusions of the committees and commissions recommend that some administrative buildings of sanatoria and preventive-medicine institutions should be used as pre-school establishments.

Even though the 1990 plan envisages that the number of schools to be commissioned is greater than the targets set out in the 5-year plan, Kucherenko notes that in many areas the educational process will continue to be conducted according to a two- or three-shift system.

Kucherenko says that the commissions and committees conclude that the measures envisaged for 1990 "represent a serious turn toward a social reorientation of the economy and toward an increase in the people's standard of living." Nevertheless, the committees and commissions point out that the indices in this section of the plan reflect the real state of affairs with regard to solving only a small proportion of socio-economic problems. "The fact that the influence of inflation on these indices is not taken into account conceals the real picture even more," he adds. The Commission on Issues of the Development of Industry, Power Engineering, Equipment, and Technology agree with this view, Kucherenko says, "noting that the plan lacked a correlation between the required and planned production of basic types of consumer goods and foodstuffs. In order to implement the planned goals, the commissions and committees recommend that the Council of Ministers develop, by the beginning of 1990, a mechanism for indexing incomes which takes into account the real dynamics of consumer prices, that it introduce this into the practice of planning and state statistics, and that Gosplan take into account the index of the dynamics of the cost of living in its calculations of people's real income, starting with the 13th 5-year plan."

Kucherenko points out to the deputies that only a few of the indices in the social section of the plan are set by directives from the center; the rest are determined by republics or enterprises, so that the state plan is largely a guideline. This explains the contradictory and complex nature of the situation in the consumer goods and services market.

He adds: "As was noted by the consumer goods commission, this year the plan for the production of consumer goods will be underfulfilled by R11 billion. As a result, the number of deficit goods has been joined by a substantial quantity of food and industrial consumer goods." Kucherenko goes on to outline how the situation in light industry has been addressed in drawing up the plan, noting that deputies believe the government should take a number of additional measures to balance the plan for the production of consumer goods. He gives his views on what is needed in the area of fur production and exports.

Kucherenko gives deputies' views on various food products and paid services. "The task of creating new equipment for domestic service enterprises is not being fulfilled by the ministries of the machine building and defense complexes," he says. The committees and commissions consider that Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] and Gosplan should carry out additional work on balancing the plan for the production of consumer goods and the provision of paid services to the population in 1990. "The committees and commissions have made a decision to establish constant systematic control over this process," Kucherenko says.

Kucherenko moves on to the work of the agro-industrial complex. He says: "Food production is planned to raise R156 billion in 1990. In 1989 it is expected to produce R144 billion. For this purpose, the agro-industrial complex, from all sources of finance, is being allocated capital investments to the value of R63.6 billion, which exceeds the level of the 5-year plan by 1 billion. Investment in the processing sectors of the complex will grow by 12 percent as against 1989; in the social sphere by 17 percent; in road building by 20 percent; and in individual housing construction in rural areas by 23 percent.

"At the same time, in the process of examining the draft plan for 1990, the Committee on Agrarian Issues and Food came to the conclusion that it is not fully balanced with regard to material, technical, and financial resources. The volume of state centralized capital investments is lower than the level of the 5-year plan by R1.3 billion." He says deputies believe that not all reserves have been tapped within the complex itself, and speaks of the discussions that took place in the committees and commissions on the allocation of funds for the agro-industrial complex.

Kucherenko continues his report by saying that at the Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food, the question was raised of reducing subsidies to the agro-industrial complex, noting that the USSR Ministry of Finance and the USSR State Planning Committee need to sort out this issue so that the people can correctly interpret the true purpose of these subsidies. The problem of housing remains acute. Kucherenko says: "The question of gasification in the rural areas is being solved extremely slowly." "There is a shortage of many industrial goods, food products, and even bread in rural shops," he adds. Analysis shows that the system of distributing market assets between state trade and the consumer corporation is based on a diktat of state trade, and is leading to discrimination against the rural inhabitant. "While serving some 40 percent of the country's population, the consumer corporations receive just 27 percent of market allocations," Kucherenko says. This practice must be changed. He adds: "The deputies are unanimous that the development of the rural areas today is a political and not just an economic question."

He goes on to stress the increased responsibility of local soviets for ensuring the provision of food products to the territories under their jurisdiction. Deputies stipulated the need to instruct the government to investigate the allocation of centralized capital investments amounting to an additional R1.3 billion of fuel and other material-technical resources;to agro- industrial development.

Kucherenko then moves on to the ecological situation in the country "which has deteriorated over recent years." Demonstrations have increased and there has been an increase in the green movement. "The Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources has scrupulously examined the draft plan and put forward a number of serious comments. Despite the general growth in investment for the purposes of environmental protection, there has been a marked tendency in a number of industies to cut this expenditure. For example, capital investments on ecology in ferrous metallurgy have been reduced," Kucherenko says. There have also been reductions in nonferrous metallurgy and the Timber Industry Ministry systematically fails to fulfill the plan. Kucherenko says: "Deputies noted, in particular, the chronic failure to fulfill environmental protection measures. For 1990 as a whole, in 10 out of the 14 main directions of environmental protection work, the plan in comparison with the 5-year plan task has been reduced." The Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational use of Resources has urgently demanded that these shortcomings be eliminated, he says. On the subject of environmental protection, Kucherenko says, the Committee on Issues of Ecology and Rational Utilization of Natural Resources is demanding that preventive measures be implemented by 1990 and that priority be given in financing to production making little or no waste. "In 1990, it is essential to prepare for the introduction of a system of paying for using nature, and of payments for the emission of pollutants," he says.

Kucherenko goes on to speak of the deputies' scepticism about the claim by Gossnab that the priority is to ensure material and technical supplies for consumer goods and services and the development of the social sphere because, in the past, such declarations have been accompanied by shortages of more and more items. Although the central allocation of resources is being cut, there is no adequate mechanism to combat negative tendencies in their allocation in the localities, Kucherenko says. Most of the committees and commissions believe that the work on production of consumer goods has not been finished, and that the government should continue it. According to Kucherenko, material production is what makes the greatest contribution to the solution of the social tasks facing society. The deputies agreed that tomorrow's potential is laid down today. The tasks must be defined more clearly to get the balance of investment right. "It was necessary to take into account a significant limitation of the state's ability to regulate the economic activity of enterprises," Kucherenko says. According to Kucherenko, "the Commission on Issues of Development of Industry and Power Engineering and the Committee on Science noted that the 1990 plan is very finely balanced for fuel and energy resources. In this connection, in the autumn and winter period of 1989-90 power for the national economy and the population could be in very short supply due to a lowering of reserves of capacities at power stations, the extraction of coal, oil, and gas condensate in comparison with the tasks of the 5-year plan, and less attention being paid to the construction and reequipment of atomic power stations. Under these conditions, it is intended to obtain the whole increment in the output of industrial production in 1990 without increasing the use of electric power, by means of structural perestroyka of industry, energy saving, and the use of recycled resources."

But there there are no real economic stimuli to guarantee that this policy will be carried out, Kucherenko adds. The freezing of the rates of bringing in new energy facilities could thus affect not only the industrial potential in the 13th 5-Year-Plan period, but also the social perestroyka of society. "In solving current tasks, we must not forget about tomorrow's tasks, lest apparent gains should turn tomorrow into losses of many millions," he says. Social perestroyka will not be solved simply by means of redistribution. The decision to cut centralized capital investment in the development of the gas and electricity industries does not accord with the priority given to maintaining facilities under construction or reconstructing existing ones, he states.

Kucherenko says that the decisions on reducing centralized capital investments have not been backed by appropriate calculations. The instability of the fuel and power engineering complex has affected other industries, especially railway transport. According to Kucherenko, there are positive tendencies in machine-building. However, the industry has failed to fulfill important social orders. "Specifically," he says," the fulfilment of the program for developing equipment for producing disposable syringes has been wrecked. No radical improvement in raising the scientific and technical potential of the machine-building complex itself is expected. As a result, the quality of many kinds of technical equipment is low and precludes it from breaking into foreign markets on a large scale". The redirection of defense industry toward national economic tasks is developing only slowly and not in a comprehensive way, he says. If investments in the development of material and technical base of the national economy are further reduced in the 13th 5-year plan, too, the economy may run into a whole number of difficult problems. Kucherenko explains that "when issues of developing industry were examined, the Committee for Issues of Defense and State Security carried out a good deal of work on determining conditions for the conversion of the defense industry in 1990. Deputies noted that as a result of the conversion that is being carried out, the expenditure for producing military output is being reduced while increasing by 14 percent in the area of civilian output. Compared to 1989, deliveries of technological equipment for the agroindustrial complex will increase by 36 percent, for light industry by 7 percent, and trade and public catering enterprises by 10 percent".

Kucherenko goes on to describe the investment program for 1990 and debates around it, particularly around the distribution of capital investments, because out of the total amount of state capital investments allocated for the production sphere—R143.4 billion—over 58 percent are accounted for by the funds earned by enterprises and are, therefore, outside the deputies' authority. Hence, the entire reduction of investment resources falls on the state centralized capital investments which will have been reduced by R23 billion by 1990 anyway. Any further reductions are fraught with serious consequences for the strategic development of the national economy, Kucherenko says.

He goes on to outline deputies' views on how additional resources should be found for the development of the social sphere, contrasting present procedures with those of the past. "Such an approach met with resistance from the commissions and committees, and they recommended—in forming the plan for the 13th 5-year plan—taking a better grounded approach to matters relating to the determination of the efficacy of the development of social production."

He moves on to the discussion in the committees and commissions on foreign economic activity. There were "very critical" remarks on this part of the plan by deputies in the Committee on International Affairs, he says. "It is difficult to square in one's mind the colossal raw material export possibilities of the state with the growth in the foreign economic debt. Deputies noted bluntly that a sale of national riches was under way, that the country was more and more becoming transformed into a raw material adjunct of Europe, concentrating on its territory the dirtiest production processes from the ecological point of view. The task of developing the national export potential was being addressed extremely slowly." He says that discussion at the committees and commissions had shown that the level and structure of the country's foreign economic relations are still far from corresponding to the country's potential. "Moreover, in recent years we have seen an alarming tendency toward a worsening in the overall results of the work of the Soviet foreign economic complex, and a weakening of the USSR's position in the foreign market." There is still low efficiency in the use of imported equipment, he notes. Going on to the country's external accounts, he says: "The forced above-plan purchases of food and consumer goods, and the equipment for their production, in conditions of limited payments, have in recent years led to a sharp rise in the foreign debt of the USSR in freely convertible currency. The state of our accounts with Hungary, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia are becoming ever more acute. At the beginning of 1989, the Soviet Union, in its payment relations with the socialist countries as a whole became a debtor for the first time. Therefore, a considerable portion of its divisions and positions are of an extreme nature, and many of the proposed solutions are enforced ones."

Expenditure on rendering economic aid to foreign countries has also been reduced substantially and the commissions and committees deem it necessary to instruct the government to take control over currency discipline and work out additional measures to enhance responsibility for effective use of the means of currency, he states.

Kucherenko then turns to regional economic policy, stressing that different levels of economic and social development in republics and regions may affect their ability to go over to regional financial autonomy and cause further problems.

Kucherenko proceeds by describing certain problems of drawing up the budget for 1990. "It is no secret for anybody that the grave situation of the state finances, the budget deficit, the inflationary price rises, the weak state control of the growth of incomes of enterprises and private individuals against the background of the increasing deficit of resources, and the loss-making performance of many enterprises are the sorest spots of our economy today. The serious disorder of money circulation and the complication of the financial situation require urgent measures to be taken to overcome as soon as possible the financial imbalance. In the view of deputies, the developing process of the radical economic restructuring of society and the advance toward financial improvement that has started—although gaining strength gradually—have so far not brought about qualitative changes. The relationship between the growth of labor productivity and that of average wages has sharply deteriorated, which entails the payment of nonearned money. This leads to an increasing imbalance between the population's income and expenses and a fall in the purchasing power of the ruble. The government was also criticized for not taking resolute measures aimed at attracting the enormous financial resources of the frozen reserves of goods and material values into the economic turnover. They amount to R478 billion, including 188 billion above normative [sverkhnormativnyye]. Unproductive expenses and losses continue to be a burden on the finances of enterprises and branches of the national economy. They exceed R24 billion annually. The state debt is growing, and by the end of this year it will reach R400 billion. In this connection deputies think that the USSR Supreme Soviet must determine a ceiling for the amount of internal state debt, having linked it with the pace of the country's economic and social development."

Efforts should be made by various relevant bodies to find sources of budget income, he says. Commissions and committees came out for stepping up governmental control over the fulfillment of the plan for producing R435,000 million-worth of consumer goods and securing R122 billion for the budget as turnover tax, he recalls, and some original sources of income for the budget were considered, too. Tax on labor remuneration increases amounting to R3 billion has been envisaged in revenues, and it will be channelled to the strengthening of material base on the social sphere, he notes. The draft budget also envisages attracting money from the population through state loans, with the purpose of reducing the budget deficit, he says.

Kucharenko goes on to say that the draft budget divides expenditures on current and development expenditures: The current expenditures, amounting to R406 billion, or over 83 percent of the budget, have been fully balanced out by income. The development budget, which envisages R81.4 billion, has not been fully backed by income, he notes. From this sum, over R53 billion are channelled to capital investment, about R11 billion are given to fundamental science and the development of centralized programs of scientific progress, and over R15 billion to cultural establishments and events, he says. Therefore, order should be introduced in spending money, he contends.

Kucherenko says that the commissions and committees analyzed the budget and the plan to make good the deficit by floating loans, while the Planning and Budget and Finance Commission responded by working out alternatives for a nondeficit budget. It suggested increasing the income of the budget, pointing out that the draft state budget is based on maximum use of the reserves of the national economy, he recalls. Secondly, if budget expenditures continue to be cut on capital investment in the productive sphere, this could lead to serious deformations of the economy and social complications, he says. Neither deputies nor people would support cuts in spending on the social sphere, he claims. The financial policy must think not only of the present, but also include a package of measures aimed at the future, he concludes. "Comrade deputies, as the discussion showed, the most important task of cutting the budget deficit is to move, in the shortest possible time, away from the free financing of the development of the material production industries toward the giving of credit. To this end, the main principle of the budget and financial economy will be the financing of specific, targetted programs of general state importance." He says that the commissions and committees support the positive trends of structural changes in the stage budget, especially cuts in spending on the economy and defense, and increases in spending on social and cultural ends. At the same time, he recalls, they called for greater control over the return on spending in the social sphere, since it is often not mastered or carried out.

Passing on to the financing of agriculture, Kucherenko says that it is planned to spend about R116.5 billion in 1990, a growth of 8 billion rubles, or 7.5 percent in comparison with this year, while about R100 billion goes to making good the difference in prices for agricultural goods, specific types of food goods, and subsidies and mark-ups, which is not a good way to improve agricultural efficiency. He recalls that the commissions and committees looked for ways to cut these allocations by R3.3 billion and to spend this money on satisfying the social needs of the villages, including about R1 billion to cut the price of electricity for domestic consumption. He says they want the Council of Ministers to examine the issue of increasing the efficiency of the use of subsidies for agricultural goods, aiming to decrease them as financial autonomy in rural areas is developed.

He points out that many of the committees and commissions asked about increasing spending on important social needs by R49.3 billion, while the government proposed a budget with an income of R428 billion, and spending of R488 billion. "The question arose: From what sources can we satisfy these extra needs? Only within real extra income budget sources that are found. Many committees and commissions worked actively to search them out. As a result of their examination of the State Budget for 1990, the deputies consider that there are possibilities, along with the R3 billion reallocated in the agro-industrial complex, to allocate another R5.9 billion from the budget to improving the social provisions to the population, institutions for health care, popular education, and culture. To provide the spending envisaged, the government will have to find relevant material and technical resources worth R2.1 billion extra during the fulfillment of the plan."

"At the same time, the government is proposing to reduce budget expenditure by the overall sum of R1.8 billion, including the liquidation of the institution of the State Acceptance System—R300 million—reduction in the financing of TASS, APN, and television and radio broadcasting—R200 million—gratuitous assistance to foreign states—R400 million—and expenditure on geological prospecting and investigation work—R800 million—and others." Taking all this into consideration, Supreme Soviet committees and commissions propose that the state plan and budget for 1990 and the report on the execution of the 1989 budget in the sums presented by the government be approved, he states.

Kucherenko reminds the deputies that the commissions and committees are examining a package of laws which, from 1990, will substantially alter the basis of economic development. He also points out that next year there will be elections to republican bodies and local soviets. He says that this is a process which will complete the reform of the country's political system and lead to a widening of the rights and increase in responsibility of soviets of people's deputies. He concludes by saying that in order to fulfill the tasks set for next year, the country must mobilize all its production and scientific and intellectual potential.

Moscow TV Carries 30 Oct Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD3010183289

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 30 October begins carrying a recorded relay of the proceedings at the 30 October session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin.

The session is opened by Gorbachev. Registration: 441 present. On today's agenda is discussion of the State Plan and Budget for 1990. Gorbachev introductory remarks.

At 1604, Kucherenko, chairman of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission of the Soviet of the Union, takes the floor to deliver his report. Kucherenko comments on the background to the drawing up of the plan in the context of the current economic situation. Razumovskiy and Zaykov are shown in the auditorium.

At 1615, Ryzhkov and Vorotnikov are shown in the auditorium. Nishanov and Lukyanov are shown on the presidium to the left of Gorbachev.

At 1705, Kucherenko ends his address. Gorbachev asks how questions to Kucherenko should be handled. Deputies raise questions regarding standing orders, the relay is cut at 1706 GMT.

At 1721 GMT, the relay takes up where it left off. Gorbachev gives the floor to Vilkas, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Social and Economic Development of Constituent and Autonomous Regions and Territories.

1740 GMT

LD3010195389

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1740 GMT continues carrying a recorded relay of the 30 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Vilkas ends his address and Voronin takes the floor.

At 1811, Gorbachev announces a 20-minute break with half of Voronin's report to come.

At 1812, the relay shows the afternoon session opening. Gorbachev passes floor back to Voronin.

At 1847, Gorbachev passes the floor to Pavlov, minister of finances.

At 1922, Pavlov ends speech. Gorbachev suggests that the debate be opened with a time-limit on each speaker of 10 minutes. This is put to the vote. 387 for, 28 against, 5 abstentions.

At 1927, first to speak in the debate is Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

At 1936, the evening session is shown opening. Gorbachev asks the Supreme Soviet members to register.

At 1938, Yakovlev speaks, voicing his views on the day's previous speeches and the plan and budget. The 1990 plan and budget has advantages over its predecessors. Yet there are difficulties in various regions and industries. Too much is being spent on building preservation rather than construction. Resources should be allocated to those sectors indicated in the plan which require this, in order that the construction industry should be balanced. There are many problems and waiting lists for accommodation. As for roads: We have "transport sclerosis" which is holding up the movement of cargo.

1946 GMT

LD3010211289

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1946 GMT continues carrying a recorded relay of the 30 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

Yakovlev concludes his remarks at this time.

At 1947, Gorbachev hands over to Kiselev, chairman of the Commission on Consumer Goods, Trade, Municipal, and Other Services.

Kiselev comments on the extent to which the plan and budget met the set task of giving priority to consumer goods production. Contracts for the supply of raw materials to enterprises are not being carried out. The Commission proposes that measures be taken to ensure fulfillment of contracts for the supply of raw materials and equipment for their processing. In the last 2 months, the country has failed to receive nonfoodstuff consumer goods worth R12 million. The appropriate bodies should be made materially responsible for the fulfillment of contracts, including those with foreign organizations. The results of the country's economic performance in the first 9 months of 1989 prove that consumer goods production is not being assigned priority.

Light industry is not developing at the rate which its indispensible position in the economy would require. It is being starved of resources, and yet it is an industry that produces R11 for every R1 invested.

At 1958, Gorabchev hands over to Nikolay Shmelev, departmental head in the United States and Canada Institute.

Shmelev says that this is the first attempt to balance the population's spending and income.

One area for cutbacks—which are desirable to get the plan and budget into shape—is that of the subsidies for poorly operating farms; a second area is the spending on aid to third-world countries. The ruble is now paralyzed. The number-one problem in the country is how to eliminate the mountains of money which are undermining the economy. This money can be bought up by the state, or tied down—the cheapest way to do this being to import foreign goods to soak the spare rubles up. Another way is to avoid strangling cooperatives and to give them time to develop. Land and housing could also be sold off. Loans could be given for apartments and cars, payable in, say, 5 years; the citizen would lend the money to the state and then receive the property. By importing sugar from Cuba the state is helping black marketeers who make moonshine.

Shmelev does not agree that the national debt is too high. Look at other countries, he says. why not sell apartments and even land to foreigners? Shmelev ends his speech by saying that all other countries do this; and it would be one way to halt the current economic situation.

At 2011, Gorbachev hands over to Masol, chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers.

Masol says the 1990 Plan and Budget drafts will help to resolve some current problems. One such problem is that of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. The Ministry of Power Engineering and other ministries could do more to clear up the situation and provide the victims with specific help, such as housing.

Housing is a big problem. The provision of housing for ex-military people is a sacred duty. Masol proposes that another 5 percent of the housing that is commissioned in 1990 be assigned to ex-soldiers.

Material-technical supply remains the biggest problem, especially in the agroindustrial complex, which is short of fuel, tires etc. unlike OPEC, we allow 300 million tonnes of gasoline to be sold on the open market, when there is a great shortage of it elsewhere: a strategic line of control needs to be adopted here.

On agriculture, differentiated surpluses as incorporated in the plan are wrong; for example in some regions the state procures meat at prices several rubles different from those paid to other regions. Cost-price must determine procurement prices; let the market be the determining factors. The plan and budget should be adopted.

At 2022, Gorbachev hands over to Deputy Sapegin

Sapegin says the report on the country's performance over 9 months noted the backlog in rail transport having a negative effect on the economic situation. Railways should be subject to the necessary technical development. The productivity of railways has fallen while the economy is using them more. Half of the stock of railcars is of an obsolete type. Obsolete locomotives and passenger carriages are still being used. No rolling-stock repair factory or spare-parts factory has been produced since the war. Railwaymen are living in poor social conditions; much of the housing cannot be subjected to capital repair. The most urgent issues are covered in the 1990 draft budget. Technical and disciplinary-personnel measures must be taken to improve rail safety.

2029 GMT

LD3010214489

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2029 GMT continues carrying a recorded relay of the 30 October Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin.

At this time Sapegin concludes his remarks.

At 2031, Gorbachev hands over to Lisitskiy, a deputy from the Chernomorsk works in the Ukraine.

Lisitskiy issues an appeal to adopt the plan and budget. We have run out of time and we have to adopt them and concentrate our efforts on adopting laws on leasing, land, and ownership.

At 2035, Gorbachev hands over to Deputy Lemesheva;

Lemesheva says women's work is only 20-percent mechanized in agriculture, while this area is 70-percent mechanized overall. Women also suffer from low pay with no one to look after their children. Country areas are poorly supplied with basic facilities, electricity, and gas. Young people are leaving the country, and no one wants to come out from the towns. I appeal to you deputies to turn to face the village.

Construction resources should be diverted toward villages; electricity prices should go up 1 kopek per kw, this money going to rural areas, too.

At 2039, Gorbachev hands over to Gritsenko, head of the Commission on Labor, Prices, and Social Policy.

Gritsenko says: What are we to do with our 6 million unemployed? There are also social problems in southern regions. Social policy should change and start putting most of its resources into day care, schools etc.

Our commission has not received a proper answer regarding the guarantees that the plan provisions will indeed be implemented. The day after tomorrow we will talk about the law on pensions: this law is going to involve at least R30 million.

Members of the government have made 12 provisions or commitments with regard to social policy issues. The academy of sciences, the AUCCTU, and Gosplan should work in the indexing of wages.

The plan should be recommended, but the government should ensure that there is back-up for it—we should recommend this.

At 2049, Gorbachev hands over to Orlov.

Orlov says he has been involved in work on the plan and budget. They must of course be different from those of the past. The limits for the budget deficit and issue of currency must be adhered to. The government has been drawn into a debate in distributing and redistributing resources rather than looking at ways of making income. The issue of currency—the restrictions set out in the plan and budget may be exceeded in reality. Everyone is demanding that the economy be balanced but this could lead to a recentralization of state distribution of resources leading to the death of independent enterprises. The economy cannot be changed abruptly as it is subject to the forces of inertia; this also applies to attempts to cut the national debt.

The plan and budget will be of a transitional nature in 1990; the 13th 5-year plan will be the turning-point. The Supreme Soviet must give the government powers to take extraordinary measures, and must not tie its hands. I appeal for your realism and for the adoption of the plan and budget, Orlov concludes.

2101 GMT

LD3010220189

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2101 GMT continues carrying a recorded relay of the 30 October Supreme Soviet Session in the Kremlin.

Gorbachev hands over to Engver, head of a subcommittee of the Committee for Youth Affairs.

Nikolay Engver says the government has done a great deal to make the plan/budget deal with the most urgent current problems. This is a plan which can be fulfilled. I call on you to adopt the budget and plan.

But the plan and budget do not take into account the 1990 package of laws on ownership, land etc. The traditional method that has been used to develop the plan does not allow the needs of individual social strata to be taken into account. I propose that we look at the extent to which these documents deal with the needs of say, the Udmurt people. To what extent do the group-a enterprises provide for the needs of the group-B producers? the plan and budget should show this. To what extent are the group-B enterprises meeting the orders from the trade sector? The state acceptance system: It will protect us for as long as the producer fails to reckon with the consumer's needs. Engver continues: Nonnecessary goods should have more realistic, balanced prices. This will consume the spare cash in the country which we have been talking about. Intourist should be closely watched: It is a high-profit institution dealing with foreign currency, but how effectively is it operating? I propose that three versions of the 13th five-year plan budget be submitted by the government. Communists and the Komsomol should tighten their own economic belts, too.

At 2114, Gorbachev hands over to Sotnikov: The draft plan does not reflect reality. The anti-alcohol campaign and state acceptance dealt a heavy blow to the state budget while favoring black marketeers. These faulty decisions should be scrapped. State acceptance staff is growing rapidly and now numbers 70,000.

At 2120, Gorbachev suggests a future working schedule of the session, listing draft laws which should be examined and dates.

At 2128, an unidentified deputy disagrees with Gorbachev's program and proposes to put it to a vote. Gorbachev says that their disagreement is not essential and the hall agrees.

At 2130, Gorbachev says the plenary powers of Deputies Melnikov, Nikitin, and Vorontsov should be revoked because they are members of Council of Ministers. kuguldinov takes the floor and criticizes this rule and article of the constitution.

At 2135, Gorbachev stresses the need to separate legislative and executive power. Proposal on the three deputies put to a vote. The majority agrees.

At 2137 the recorded relay ends.

Gorbachev Concluding Remarks at 30 Oct Session

LD3110104389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2120 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Remarks by President Mikhail Gorbachev at the Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 30 october—recorded]

[Text] Comrades, we have 15 minutes left, and perhaps we should suspend the debates now and speak about the issues we planned to discuss. Permit me to give you a short view about an approximate schedule for the work of the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet from 30 October-24 November 1989.

All in all, we have consciously opted to map out our work practically 1 month in advance. Well, we are implementing the discussion of the plan and budget as we planned it. After this, probably on 1 November, the draft standing orders of the congress and of the Supreme Soviet and the draft laws on mandates, on the status of deputies, and on recall could be accepted for examination and handed over to committees and commissions. As you know, we are to submit these drafts to the Congress for examination. We have to carry out this work with you, and in a substantial way at that.

Sometime in mid-November, after examination in both committees and commissions, we will have to return to these questions, discuss them, and make a decision. This is the second point. Thirdly, one can already examine the draft legislation on the judicial system and other laws on the court as early as this week. As you recall, we planned to discuss them last week, but we failed to do that; we were simply short of time, although, as commissions and committees reckon, these documents have been prepared, and they are necessary.

Also, we plan—and this is very important, in my view, and people are waiting for this; at least, the mail that is available to us and the information coming through you shows that people are waiting for us to examine it—I have in mind the draft law on providing pensions to USSR citizens. Therefore, a report by the USSR Council of Ministers on this issue could be listened to, as we are planning . And in accordance with the instruction of the

Supreme Soviet, this draft law was submitted to the Supreme Soviet by the Council of Ministers the other day.

Then, you remember that we have already said as a preliminary that this is such an important document concerning our entire society, which should be submitted for discussion, and we should listen to the opinion of the public and the people. Some committees and commissions will work, it appears, on 3 and 4 November. Then, due to the November celebrations, there will be a short interval in the work of the session and we can assemble again on 13 November, on Monday, to solve, first of all, the issue of convening the second congress. The Constitution places the adoption of such a decision precisely on the USSR Supreme Soviet.

As you know, there is an entry in the decisions of the First Congress of People's Deputies on the need for holding another congress late this year, and it was no accident that this entry was made. This was done as a result of discussion. True, I also think it necessary to recall this because there is feeling among the deputies on whether there is a need to hold a congress of soviets at the end of the year. [indistinct voices from the floor]

So, I present you with all this information for reflection right away, so to speak, so that you may think about it. But we agree with you about this at the congress. Then one could examine in the first reading the draft laws on the free development and equal use of the languages of the USSR's peoples, on the free national development of USSR citizens who reside beyond their national and state formations or do not have them on USSR territory, and on USSR citizenship.

Active work is being done now on these draft laws in committees and commissions, on all three. There was a preliminary discussion of this issue at the Supreme Soviet Presidium and relevant drafts were handed to commissions. There is a proposal to return once again to the draft law on property in the USSR, perfected with regard to discussion, on 14 November. Again, as this is a question which concerns our entire society and which touches on the fundamental foundations of our system, we have to put it forward for discussion by the people, for a nationwide discussion.

Apart from the above issues, information by certain commissions is to be heard and individual issues which we mapped out earlier are to be examined at the session. From 20 to 24 November plenary sessions of the chambers are to be held, where we will be able to discuss a number of draft laws in the second reading which have been adopted for examination by the Supreme Soviet and which are now being studied in committees and commissions.

All in all, as you see, the schedule looks quite tight, intense, and substantive. On the whole, we will have to do a good deal of solid work. In this connection, of course, one cannot fail to respond to the reasons voiced by deputies Borodin, Romanenko, Alekseyev, and others, and in the press, to the effect that we should not distract ourselves by secondary issues at this crucial stage in the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet and should not lead the Supreme Soviet away, toward examining other, maybe even important issues—life supplies them all the time—but should complete work on these fundamental issues. So this guideline plan of work for the second session emerged as a result of these reflections and estimates.

Well, you have had a chance to look at it. What remarks do you have, comrades? Why do we call it a guideline plan? We do not regard it as a blueprint or a dogma. But still there should be a planned character and organization in work. If something comes up for us, so to speak, in the course of the work, clearly, as always, we will discuss it and find a solution. [Lukyanov says: "Someone wants to speak."]

Does someone want to speak? Ah, Comrade [name indistinct]. Come up here, please, to the microphone, or on to the rostrum, wherever is closest and most comfortable. Go ahead.

[Unidentified Deputy] Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have just given the program, and once again, I think that we are getting away from the main issue. I would like, after all, to put to the vote the questions of leasing, property—that is, the main laws which we have just been working on. It would seem that we, and the people, are waiting for them from us. I think that we have gone a little astray and have left out the main laws. So I ask that it be put to a vote so that these issues can be examined during this session, on land, on leasing, on property.

[Gorbachev] Comrades, I think that it was actually me that was trying to get this idea across. And we have in mind, comrade [name indistinct], we have no disagreements on this, this is being borne in mind. I, perhaps, singled out and cited the law on property, on pension provision, but the law on property and the whole of this package which is linked—I am not going through the whole lot, it is all that is needed. I think that we will still have to work, so to speak, right up to 1 January, or well, perhaps up to 31 December. Anything can happen. Can we take this as a basis for work, comrades?

So we do not need to vote on this? We do not. That is an organizational factor. OK, so we are agreed.

Supreme Soviet Resumes; Changes Schedule 31 Oct

LD3110085189 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 31 OCT 89

[Text] Moscow October 31 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

At a joint sitting of the houses of parliament, presided over by Mikhail Gorbachev, the USSR Supreme Soviet today continued hearings on the draft state plan and budget of the country for 1990.

These documents have been discussed in parliamentary committees and commissions for 1.5 months.

Many deputies today suggest that the drafts be put to vote, for they believe that the parliament is faced with a 'time snag'.

Discussion of the bills has taken up more time than was originally allotted at the beginning of the parliament session: Deputies strive to work out the documents in detail.

But they are pressed for time. The Soviet Union's national holiday—the anniversary of the October Revolution—will be celebrated soon and deputies will take a several-day-long recess.

As a result, the parliament will deviate from the practice of holding plenary sittings only on Mondays and Tuesdays.

This week parliament will also meet on Wednesday and Thursday to discuss draft regulations for the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, bills on the status of deputies and a procedure for recalling them.

They are also to consider draft fundamentals of legislation on judicial procedure and other laws about the court.

The deputies will hear a government report on a pensions bill and decide on further elaboration of it.

After the recess the deputies intend to return to the package of economic bills, including a bill on property in the Soviet Union. They also need to decide on a date for the convocation of the second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies.

Political & Social

Demonstrators Surround Moscow KGB Headquarters

Create 'Confusion'

LD3010202689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Once again there has been an unauthorized meeting in the center of Moscow and once again there has been a familiar crush on the sidewalks and the thoroughfares, long, long traffic jams, and police units. This was the picture on the evening of 30 October on Pushkin Square. It soon became clear that what the so called Democratic Union required was not a meeting as such; its purpose was a different one—to create as much confusion as possible, to hold up two or three antigovernment placards, and cry out appropriate slogans.

It started off peacefully. The Memorial Society had been permitted to gather in Dzerzhinskiy Square, as stated in its application, to honor the memory of the illegally repressed. For half an hour people stood around the building of the USSR KGB holding lighted candles in their hands and they were beginning to disperse as the Democratic Union became involved. At once a crowd formed which moved along Pushkin Street paralyzing traffic. They were stopped by a detachment of special purpose militia. Then the crowd percolated through courtyards to the crossing of Gorkiy Street and the Boulevard ring, and that is where it started. It was simply impossible to make anything out in the general uproar and melee. The militia must be given their due. They only began to arrest the most impassioned ones when the situation became fraught with serious violations of public order.

The Democratic Union had been permitted to hold a meeting that day, but at Luzhniki, a TASS correspondent was told by Militia Major-General (Postoyuk), head of the Public Order Preservation Administration. The union is well aware that it is forbidden to hold meetings on Pushkin Square. This was the result: It turned out to be a real fight. According to preliminary data around 40 people were arrested. Traffic was disrupted in the center of Moscow.

Police Disperse Anti-KGB Protest

AU3010192489 Paris AFP in English 1912 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 30 (AFP)—Police Monday brutally broke up a demonstration by about 1,000 people who had formed a human chain around the headquarters of the Soviet secret police (KGB) here in a tribute to political prisoners.

Police took action after the demonstrators shouted "Down with the KGB" and "The KGB is the enemy of the people",an AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE reporter said.

The police beat up those who tried to sit down to continue their protest, and made a number of arrests.

Forty Detained

AU3110083089 Paris AFP in English 0226 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 31 (AFP)—Police brutally broke up a protest against the Soviet secret police (KGB) here Monday and detained 40 people, after an unprecedented demonstration by more than 1,000 outside KGB headquarters.

State radio reported that the 40 detained were accused of having "violated public order" during a protest by 100 demonstrators, organised by the Democratic Union opposition movememt.

Chanting "Down with the KGB" and "The KGB is the enemy of the people", the protesters were trying to march on Pushkin Square, a rallying point for Soviet dissent, before being dispersed by riot police. Some protesters sat down, but were beaten up and swiftly carried away by police.

A local police chief, quoted by the official Soviet news agency TASS, said that the group had been authorised to hold its meeting elsewhere, and condemned its attempt to rally in Pushkin Square.

Major General Postoyuk said that "the Democratic Union had the authorisation to hold a meeting Monday, but at Loujniki"—a suburban sports stadium.

"The Union knows full well that gatherings in Pushkin Square are prohibited. What happened was genuine disorder", he added.

The group of 100 were a splinter from a separate demonstration, held outside nearby KGB headaquarters, after it had been drawn to a close by its organisers —the anti-Stalinist movement Memorial.

More than 1,000 mainly young people carrying candles formed a human chain around KGB headquarters in a silent tribute to political prisoners, who had been interrogated within the walls of the building.

Memorial leader Lev Ponomarev said nobody had asked authorities to authorize the meeting as it was to be held in silence and "without slogans".

However, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov told human rights campaigner Andrey Sakharov in a telephone conversation Saturday that police would not move in to break up the rally, Mr. Ponomarev said. Mr. Kryuchkov was "not particularly enthusiastic" about the protest, he added.

Police cordoned off Dzerzhinskiy Square and streets leading to KGB headquarters to forestall further protests.

Outside KGB headquarters, demonstrators recalled the infamous deeds of the secret police.

"I shall never forget it," an elderly woman said of the 1938 arrest and subsequent execution of her father, a senior foreign ministry official.

Another demonstrator, identified only as Alexander, said his father was arrested in 1949 and taken to Lubyanka prison, adjacent to KGB headquarters. He returned from labour camp five years later, a broken man.

"As long as this organization (the KGB) exists, freedom will be threatened," a 29-year-old woman, Volodia, said.

Another woman, Irina Kalinina, criticized "those who are afraid of the truth" about Stalinism because they were "directly or indirectly involved in the terror."

Striking an upbeat note, she added: "Gorbachev was the first to give us victims of repression the possibility to speak."

She said there would be no renewal of Stalin-style arrests in the dead of night, followed by secret executions, even if President Mikhail Gorbachev resigned.

Director of Strikebound Vorkuta Mine Replaced

PM3010193189 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 2

[Report by own correspondent V. Krukovskiy: "Miners' Decision"]

[Excerpt] A new director of the still striking "Vorgashorskaya" mine—the largest enterprise in the Pechora basin—has been elected. The new director is former deputy director for production P. Yermakov. This was what all the miners still not at work decided on Sunday. This is now the only collective in Vorkuta not mining coal. [passage omitted]

Strike 'Double-Edged Sword'

PM3010190389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondents Aleksandr Tretyakov and Viktor Filippov under the general heading "Direct Line": "Seething Passions..."]

[Text] Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] and Vologda— The Vorkuta city workers' (strike) committee has adopted a decision to hold a general strike on 1 November from 1100 through 1300 hours as a sign of solidarity with the demands made by the "Vorgashorskaya" Mine. What, then, are these demands that are capable of making people resort to such extreme measures?

"IZVESTIYA No 302 reported that we did not obey the decision of the city conference of workers' committees to cease striking from 0000 hours 27 October," was the grievance aired to journalists by S. Kozlov, deputy chairman of the "Vorgashorskaya" strike committee. "That decision was in the form of a recommendation, but we act as we see best and are determined to hold out to the end. We are opposed to the decision of the Komi ASSR Supreme Court, which deemed the strike unlawful. We also demand that the government give a specific answer regarding progress in carrying out USSR Council of Ministers Resolution No 608 with an indication of who is to blame for the failure to meet the deadline for implementation of certain of its points. Miners are dissatisfied with the attitude shown toward the political demands made during the 26 October strike."

The maximum attention should undoubtedly be paid to any grievance voiced by working people, particularly when those grievances are justified. But is it reasonable for the miners to again make use of their big guns in this matter today?

All trains to and from Vorkuta go via Vologda—so we asked the railroad workers how things are with them now.

"The mood in the collective is that the miners should be presented with a bill," replied V. Nikitichev, chief of the Vologda Department of the Northern Railroad. "We have been unable to normalize freight flow since the July strike. 'Vorgashorskaya' is now on strike and not dispatching its daily 200 wagonloads of coal. But our living, after all, is based on tonne-kilometers: The more freight we handle, the larger the payments made into the socio-cultural development funds. The miners have unwittingly really devastated our earnings."

At the Cherepovets Metallurgical Combine each piece of news from Vorkuta is also greeted with alarm:

"The July action by miners is still causing us repercussions" was the opinion of A. Serebrennikov, chief of the fuel and raw materials department. "We have been sent from Vorkuta the scrapings from the depots—coal which is is difficult to enrich and is oxidized. It has behaved abominably in the coke-oven batteries. Let's hope this won't be repeated..."

It turns out to be a double-edged sword: They have used the strike to hit at the bureaucracy but have given their brother workers a bloody nose at the same time. And now we have strikes again. But perhaps we should think hard first.

Further on Strike

LD3010202989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi ASSR) 30 Oct (TASS)—TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov reports:

The collective of the Vorgashorskaya mine, one of the largest in the country, is continuing to strike in the polar town. Yesterday, despite the fact that it was Sunday, the majority of mines of the Vorkutaugol association continued to extract the fuel in the normal working rythm, as during a working day. As a result, it has been possible to reduce by half the lag in the extraction of coal which had accumulated since the beginning of October, by almost 38,000 tonnes. However, obviously it will hardly be possible to smooth out the monthly plan by this indicator.

The Vorkuta miners' lag in dispatching coal to the consumers is growing rapidly. Since the beginning of the month they have already failed to unload over 25,000 tonnes, including a considerable quantity of coking coal. Daily, the "minus" runs to over 200 freight cars of 12-15,000 tonnes. Yesterday, at an all-town meeting, a representative of the Cherepovets metallurgical combine announced that a threat had arisen of halting the coke furnaces at the enterprise, and called on the Vorkuta people to stop the strike.

As V. Kopasov, cochairman of Vorkuta town workers' (strike) committee, has announced, a conference of the strike committee of the enterprises on Saturday, 28 October decided to use pressure tactics on the ministries and government of the country by means of warning strikes. The gist of the tactics is that if in the envisaged term the point of the resolution of the USSR Council of Ministers of 3 August 1989, No 608 "on measures to ensure fulfillment of joint decisions by government commissions with the participation of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions and strike committees of workers of the coalfields of the country" is not fulfilled, a warning 2-hour strike is held in one of the working shifts. Then, 10 days later, if the point is still not fulfilled, the same kind of strike is repeated, but this time in two shifts.

The Vorkuta strike committees intend to hold the first 2-hour warning strike on 1 November.

V. Gobrusev, former chairman of the town's working (strike) committee, recently elected secretary of Vorkuta Territorial committee of the Trade Union of Coal Industry Workers, says:

The Territorial Committee supports the demands of the coalminers and the tactics proposed by the strike committees of pressure by means of warning strikes, in order to effect fulfillment of government resolution No 608 in the envisaged term. Our trade union committee does not approve today's strike by Vorgashorskaya colliery, although the territorial committee supports the Vorgashor men's demands and will help effect their implementation. But today a multiday strike can and should be avoided.

As already announced, on 27 October the Supreme Court of Komi ASSR examined the case of the legal action of the administration of the Vorkutaugol association and Vorgashorskaya, Komsomolskaya, and Ayach-Yaga collieries against the town's workers' (strike) committee and strike committees of these enterprises. The court pronounced the strikes at these collieries unlawful. Actions from administrations of other striking enterprises have not as yet been received by the court.

Vorkuta town workers' (strike) committee intends to contest the decision of the Supreme Court of Komi ASSR and has drafted an appeal to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Court. The town's strike committee considers that the strike does not come under the law on labor disputes, citing the fact that the protocol signed in July this year by the government commission, on coordinated measures between the commission and the coalminers of Vorkuta, states that "in the event the demands of the strike committee are not fulfilled on time it retains the right to resume the strike."

Voronin on Striking Miners

LD3010215489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Oct 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Igor Fesunenko] The largest mine in the basin, Vorgashorskaya, is continuing to strike. Each day, the country fails to receive 200 railcars containing Vorkuta coal as a result of the strike. According to reports from Vorkuta, miners of other mines are planning to hold a 2-hour strike on 1 November in support of the Vorgashorskaya mine. Lev Alekseyevich, the logical question arises, why are the miners striking? Perhaps the government is not carrying out its own decision of 3 August?

[Lev Alekseyevich Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; identified by caption] I would say right away that the government is carrying out Decision 608 in full and I assure you of this with absolute responsibility. But first of all, I would like to tell both the miners, whom I hope are listening to us, and all viewers, that the following demand has been met: pay has been increased, or rather, the additional payment for miners' work during night and evening shifts has been increased, established. An additional payment has been established for all miners working underground for transportation to their place of work and back. Such major issues as the special allocation of credits of over about R300 million to allow miners to build their own individual housing have been resolved.

I am very pleased to report that the Council of Ministers has presented to the Supreme Soviet a draft law on pensions which takes into consideration the specific nature of the work of miners and those requests which they set forth during a meeting with us. Over this period, there has been additional allocations, help has been rendered, and foodstuffs and manufactured goods have been provided to many mining regions totalling hundreds of millions of rubles.

But, permit me not to continue the description. I want to say that at the Presidium of the Council of Ministers on Saturday, we discussed the draft law on leave and apparently prior to the celebrations [on 7 November], or perhaps a little later, we will be able to meet again, and it will also be presented to the Supreme Soviet. I would merely like to remind you of this point: that the draft law on leave alone will require a search for additional financial resources in the country totalling R30 billion.

[Fesunenko] You say that Decision 608 is being carried out fully. You are first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and, naturally, there are no grounds whatsoever for not trusting you. But could it not be that the miners are simply, as they say, not up on what's going on? Do they participate in verification of the implementation of that adopted decision?

[Voronin] From the very first days of work in line with this decision, we entrusted responsibility for its implementation to the Bureau for the Fuel and Power Engineering Complex of the Council of Ministers. A special group has been set up at the Ministry of the Coal Industry, which is engaged only in verification and coordination. We have connected up our information system, which reports to us on the state of affairs, so that we will be able to adopt efficient measures toward implementing this decision.

And finally, to ensure that miners know of this, once a month Comrade Lev Dmitriyevich Ryabev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and chairman of the Bureau for the Fuel and Power Engineering Complex of the Council of Ministers, will gather together representatives of labor collectives of all the country's mining regions, ministers or representatives of ministries, representatives of Councils of Ministers, and of the press; and for several days they will carry out verificaiton and a working discussion of the course of the implementation of the draft, of Decision 608. Such a verification, with the participation of all miners collectives and representatives, took place on 17-19 October. The unanimous decision was adopted and the decision is being fully implemented.

[Fesunenko] Did the miners have any grudges, complaints?

[Voronin] There were no complaints. A unanimous decision was made. There was a representative from the Pechora Basin, and it was the same. Everyone departed. If anyone had any kind of feelings of dissatisfaction then, they could easily have approached me in order to look at the whole matter. And of course, the introduction of such issues at the Vorgashorskaya Mine was a total surprise.

[Fesunenko] As is known, in order to fulfil the strikers' demands, the state is already directing about R1 billion, calculated for 1 year for additional benefits for miners. And, of course, I would like to know what the coal industry is giving the country in response to this.

[Voronin] Unfortunately I have to say that, despite the concern and attention shown in this matter, the coal industry is working unsatisfactorily today. And I appeal to all miners that this matter must be corrected. In my view, no one in the country can understand why the results of work are unsatisfactory despite our concern. In September-October alone, the national economy failed to receive over 4 Million tonnes of coal. Now, look: how can one understand this now, when winter is approaching and coal is not being extracted? After all, this hits our collective farmers, it hits the miners themselves, because there will not be a sufficient quantity of coal during the winter. Who will suffer as a result of this? This should, after all, be understandable. I hope that the miners of Vorkuta will hear this and will draw the right conclusions and will call a halt to all strikes.

23 Oct Gorbachev Speech to Economists

PM3010152589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Oct 89 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Unattributed report: "Promoting the Economic Reform. Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] As reported earlier, a conference of the country's leading economists was held at the CPSU Central Committee.

Opening the conference M.S. Gorbachev said:

You have probably already noticed, comrades, that we have gathered people here who represent the whole spectrum of interests, stances, viewpoints, and schools of thought. In short, it is necessary to have an exchange of opinions since we are clearly aware of an insufficient understanding of the key questions which we are currently discussing and on which we are to adopt decisions that will determine the direction of our society's further development.

This insufficient understanding came to the fore in particular during the discussion of the draft USSR State Plan for 1990 and the efforts to define the range of measures to restore the financial health of our market. Complications arose also during the discussion of a number of draft laws at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, above all the law on ownership and regional economic accountability; and, incidentally, the entire range of drafts relating to priority problems which must be discussed and resolved in order to expedite the economic reform.

Generally speaking, we are all equally interested today in making the most comprehensive and objective assessment of the economic and social situation which has taken shape in the country. On this, I can see, we are united. Figuratively speaking, only the epithets used will be different. On the question of the ways out of this situation opinions differ widely. True, it can be said that if a quest is under way and new problems are being tackled, different viewpoints will be expressed, producing a cacophony of opinions. If it was just a question of that, then the situation could be described as only normal and natural. However, I believe that the divergences are not just connected with the quest. They have deeper origins. Their roots clearly lie in a different understanding of the key questions, those selfsame general questions which make further progress impossible unless they are clearly understood. They include above all the question of how we see the society which we want to attain by means of perestroyka. Here, in my opinion lies the key to all the problems.

I would like to focus your attention on the difference between the conceptual plan and the detailed plan, the timetable, so to speak, of revolutionary transformations. I have already spoken about this at the meeting with leaders of the mass media. The conceptual plan is the basic outline and it consists of our desire to give a new lease of life to socialism through perestroyka and to develop the potential of the socialist system by overcoming man's alienation from property, from the means of production, from the political process, from power, and from culture. In my opinion this is basically a genuinely Marxist formulation of the problem with man as the focal point. How do we propose to achieve this? The answer lies in our conceptual plan—through democratization and glasnost, through reforming ownership relations and the political structure of our society, and through restoring the health of the moral sphere and of the entire spiritual life. In short by regarding man as the goal rather than the means.

This is the conceptual plan which has inspired us all these years and on the basis of which we are elaborating the specific paths through the complex transitional period during which there clearly will be many different stages.

Naturally, a long distance separates the conceptual plan from the attainment of the set aims, from the realization of a qualitatively new society. It is a long distance which must be travelled. Deluding ourselves and others with illusory quick solutions is simply ridiculous and unscientific.

But there are also other questions whose solution brooks no delay. They include above all the situation which has taken shape in the consumer market and the finances. This is precisely what has to be resolved as swiftly as possible so that people can taste the real fruits of perestroyka.

In other words, we are not putting the question like this: Once there is a conceptual plan, all that remains to be done is to sit back and watch. No. It is necessary promptly and deeply to analyze and accumulate our knowledge in order to be able to develop the process of the socialist renewal of society. The lessons of history have taught us that life cannot be forced into a "Procrustean bed" of dogmatic schemes. This is not the right path. We are against subjectivism and leftism. You scientists are well aware where all that has led in the past. What we need is a reliable combination of politics, science, and practice. In my opinion, such a mixture is already being obtained, probably for the first time in the history of socialism. Possibly this is the very combination which, generally speaking, despite all difficulties, will save us from doom and help us to find the correct answers to the questions facing us. We must conduct perestroyka on the basis of the adopted conceptual plan, proceeding from the realities of our society.

We want to find the answers above all in real life. This is what we are seeking when we are constantly consulting the working people and our intelligentsia, not only the scientific intelligentsia but also the creative intelligentsia, and in general, society as a whole. The work which we have begun is very, very complex and it calls for great efforts on the part of all of us. We view everything—the impulses of our time, global problems, and the experience gathered by other systems—guided by the Leninist approach and the Leninist understanding, which were not followed very much in the past. But we also follow our own road, proceeding from our realities.

Can we really throw away the 72 years during which, despite all the mistakes and deformations with which we are familiar, we have travelled a tremendous historical path. This applies both to the economy and people's mentality which have taken shape over these years, to the entire social sphere in which we have been operating for decades, and to the habits which have become part of people's lives. This is what makes up our society today. And no science which takes itself seriously can, having elaborated an idea or a scheme, even a very good and most humane one, impose it on society without taking account of its realities. Otherwise, I think it is no longer a question of science, but once again utopia, once again pseudoscience. This kind of general, pseudorevolutionary proposals are, to say the least, not serious, they are destructive. They cannot be relied on either in politics or in practical work.

I would like to emphasize once again that we must view our outline plan in the light of the realities of our society. A few days ago I read in an article: Let us return to 1917-1920 period, let us start from the beginning. What was meant was not the beginning made by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, but February 1917. This is the sort of beginning that is being suggested to us. But what kind of progress is this if we have to go back and start from "square one" as some people are suggesting. Essentially what is being proposed is the same as when we are told that it is allegedly necessary to place the development of the country on a social democratic footing.

And finally, there is yet another viewpoint. We have worked for almost 5 years in conditions of perestroyka and we can see that mechanisms and methods which have nothing in common with our society are being foisted on it as a consequence of perestroyka allegedly for the purpose of society's self-realization. This leads to the conclusion that we should be thinking about improving the administrative-command system rather than dismantling it.

And most important, comrades, society is being confronted with all this, and that sometimes introduces not a little confusion in people's minds. Any pseudorevolutionary phrase can act as a fuse here and make society veer to the right, or the left with all the ensuing consequences. It seems that any of the extreme solutions would be easier. But moving ahead consistently, step by step, implementing this most difficult of tasks, really mastering new forms of societal life, and consciously overcoming old stereotypes of thinking is, of course, much more difficult. It is very important for us now when we are about to embark on the stage of deep, truly revolutionary changes which affect the very foundations of our society—the base as well as the superstructure and the spiritual sphere—to clarify all these questions.

One can frequently hear the leadership being reproached for the fact that it is irresolute and that it is the co-originator or originator of half-measures. But irresolute with respect to what? All the same let us find out about what benchmark is being talked about. After all at the same time other people are, among other things, leveling accusations that all the processes are being forced along artificially, that the people are not having time to comprhend them, and that therefore everything is being artificially imposed upon the people. It is said that even scientists themselves cannot grasp things here and are frequently issuing mutually exclusive recommendations. How then is the ordinary man to get his bearings amid all this multiplicity of voices? Therefore, comrades, it is time to reflect, to ponder, and to compare and coordinate the various positions and approaches. This is now vitally necessary for us.

On the whole we have, I believe, made the correct choice and we must proceed along that road. Neither to turn back, nor even to stop in our tracks is possible. Many years have been lost as it is. Let us be frank. There are comrades sitting in this hall today who back in the early seventies had participated in the preparation of a Central Committee plenum on questions of the scientific and technical revolution. Essentially the rationale of the plenum were the adaptation of the socialist systemn to the scientific and technical revolution. But everything that was prepared at that time was consigned to the archives. And this was done on the eve of the world oil crisis when the most profound structural restructuring and adaptation of capitalism to the new conditions was beginning. Capitalism, smashing people's destinies, threw millions out of work onto the street and restructured itself. But we postponed that plenum, burying its ideas, and retarded the process of rational changes which had come to a head in all the socialist countries. As a result we lost 15 years at the very least.

We need to proceed more confidently along the new road if we are thinking in general about the destiny of our people, of socialism, and of the role of our state. But we need to proceed deeply convinced that in the most important things we are acting correctly. Of course, difficulties cannot be avoided—there are no such things as ideal solutions. Our complex society is overloaded with problems and it is hardly possible to expect everything to go well. Such presumptions are not for people connected with science and politics. And although current affairs journalism has now, perhaps, captured the minds of everyone—politicians, scientists, and workers—it is by no means populism that is the chief thing these days, but scientific competence, and a constructive approach when analyzing all aspects of social life.

And so we must gain an understanding of the key issues. The main thing is: toward what kind of society are we proceeding? Are we advocating a federation or something else? In what does the new role of the CPSU consist? The same applies to all the factors. If there are no true points of reference, there will be interminable arguments and nothing else. We should merely lose time. The cause of revolutionary perestroyka would suffer.

Dear comrades, I would like to ask you to be frank. After all, our conversation is for the sake of a cause on which the country's fate depends. Ultimately it is possible to implement many measures but it is necessary to know what we want and how to proceed toward what we are striving for.

The first to speak in the debate which developed afterwards was USSR People's Deputy S.S. Alekseyev, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Urals Department Philosophy and Law Institute. He emphasized that our movement's lodestar is democratic market socialism, which must also adopt social-democratic values—ownership, freedom, and the individual—which have been justified by history and practice.

Our socialist society must absorb all the achievements of civilization and embark on a new round of its development. The Law on Ownership must be adopted by the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The draft of this law contains a mechanism whereby working people can acquire real rights as owners of the means of production. This involves primarily leasing, leased enterprises, people's enterprises, and ownership by labor collectives. By means of this law we must proclaim the transmission of economic power to working people, which will solve numerous problems, including some very complex social problems.

The second question raised by the speaker was the question of taxes. By the end of the session, he said, we must produce regulations governing the taxation of different types of enterprises, and of commodity producers in general. Otherwise the economic mechanism will not function.

And finally we must begin to properly create a market. Not only to talk about it, but actually to create it. There is only one way to create a market —via the step-by-step reduction of the level of state orders. There are already certain positive developments in this direction. It is necessary to go further still, to lower state orders to 90, 80, and 70 percent so that the market can begin functioning on an organized basis.

The existing shortcomings in the economy, Academician V.V. Laptev, chief of department at the USSR Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute, said, are conditioned by the fact that we have abandoned the old methods and the new ones are not functioning. Therefore, as was already mentioned, great importance attaches to the legislative regulation of economic relations.

The adoption of the Law on Ownership in its present form will signify a radical change of society's socioeconomic structure. Here we need more than just a nationwide discussion, we need a referendum. This has been repeatedly said, but so far without any result.

There is at present some sort of euphoria associated with denationalization, attempts to replace state ownership by cooperative and private ownership, and so on. As if this would automatically guarantee efficiency. First, there is no proof that this will be so. And second, it is necessary to adopt all the good aspects of the prevailing system of ownership. After all, if we were to legalize private ownership, the mafia could gain economic power.

The speaker warned against getting carried away by buying out enterprises and proclaiming them to be people's enterprises. After all, Lenin did describe this as a total rejection of socialism. These are not people's enterprises, they are private collectives' enterprises. I think that it was correctly said: We are imperceptibly sliding from a communist approach toward a social-democratic approach.

I am confident that the development of commodity-money relations and the expansion of enterprises' and regions' autonomy and rights is the correct way. It is, however, necessary to preserve the centralized principle, the Leninist principle of democratic centralism in its new meaning.

The speaker noted in conclusion that state power is being shaken, and this contributes toward the situation's destabilization, including in the economy. He also called for a more active and more principled rebuttal of attempts to undermine the party's authority.

USSR People's Deputy P.G. Bunich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and department chief at Moscow's S. Ordzhonikidze Management Institute, spoke next. Today, he said, we must tackle specific proposals and define what can be done urgently. In such a fashion, however, that this "urgency" does not clash with fundamental tasks, and so that it is coordinated with the general line.

It is necessary to act in a fashion ensuring that people respond, that they are willing to work and earn. There are two methods to overcome alienation. The first is leasing, when people work using leased assets. They do not break them, they do not embezzle them, they strive to work decently because everything they earn belongs to them. This is one way to overcome alienation.

The second method involves the lease collective's own investments. For example, if a new shop is built using the collective's own resources, this is already the collective's own shop. It can buy out the leased facility.

The main point is that, when building up property, dividing this built-up property by shares, and distributing these shares, every person will treat accumulations the way wages are treated today. In other words, people will be working for [a share in] accumulations as well as for wages. This is what is needed.

The speaker advocated the adoption of three laws—on leasing, on ownership, and on taxation—in a single package in order to create incentives for successful work by lease collectives.

It was emphasized in the speech that ministries and departments and soviets of people's deputies do not help, and more often than not obstruct the creation of lease collectives and wreck this important work.

Speaking about urgent measures for the consumer market's recovery, the scientist suggested embarking on a large-scale sale of housing. The state is losing nothing when selling apartments to people, he said, and is essentially acquiring additional budget funds.

And a second point: Why not let people buy the land which they use as a dacha or cooperative plot or a subsidiary farm. After all, we have already, to all intents and purposes, given people their subsidiary farm plots. And we are no longer likely to claim back the land granted for dacha or cooperative use.

In the opinion of Doctor of Economic Sciences G.A. Yegiazaryan, chief of a department at the Moscow State University, one of the most important problems of current economic strategy is the need to define the limits of cooperative ownership in its interrelationship with ownership by the whole people. We cannot, he said, turn the entire economy over to cooperative ownership alone. There will be nothing left of socialism in such an event, and this will result in a typically corporate system very similar to capitalist economic management, on a completely different economic basis.

The speaker described the creation of a clear-cut taxation system as a powerful lever for the economy's stabilization at the present stage. First, he emphasized, it is important to define the main political prerequisite which will govern the building of this system, in other words it is necessary to determine whether the system will be created in conditions of federation or confederation. Should it be the former, each enterprises regardless of its location will have to pay two taxes—one to the union budget, the other to the republican. This is the way to implement enterprises' involvement in the national economic complex. In this context, in the scientist's opinion, the exclusion of cooperative enterprises from this general rule appears unfounded. We are thus excluding the entire cooperative system from the uniform tax system, even though the entire world is today based on this uniformity, in other words on the closer alignment of economic conditions in which different sectors function.

The speaker raised the question of small and medium enterprises which must enjoy certain tax benefits. So far we have not granted them such benefits, even though this is done all over the world.

The aggravation of imbalances in the national economy is increasingly applying the brakes on economic perestroyka. How can this problem be resolved? The speaker believes that the first way is by doing what is being done now: Accelerated passing of laws based on market conditions. The second way is to intensify centralized regulation of national economic proportions. Both ways ought to be actively utilized.

USSR People's Deputy N.Ya. Petrakov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Central Mathematico-Economic Institute, touched on problems of the market's creation. In his opinion, if market relations continue developing on the basis of the present inflationary money system, they will produce explosive price rises and a preferential market status for state monopoly producers and for persons and groups with large sums of money and property accumulations at their disposal, both, as a rule, unearned. This is fraught with mass demands for wage rises not on the basis of better work but by way of compensation for rising prices. Such a market will not last long. It will be unable to act as an organizing force for enhancing the quality and competitiveness of output because—if for no other reason—it will, from its very first steps, be overwhelmed by the burden of problems and imbalances inherited from the time of total domination by administrative methods of management and the sway of subjective factors.

The solution of the problem of stabilizing the ruble is rendered considerably more difficult by the acute budget deficit. What is to be done?

The main lever to combat the state budget deficit is to cut back ineffective state expenditure. Of course, one very important avenue in this sphere is to reduce defense expenditure and convert defense industry enterprises for civilian purposes. But there is a need for serious changes in investment policy throughout the national economy.

It is well known that the volume of capital investments and the extent to which they are financed are by no means identical terms in our economy, and this often leads to misunderstandings when investment policy questions are discussed. Capital investment means the unity of three elements—material resources and equipment components, construction organizations' capacity, and finance. This unity is disrupted at present. This situation is a legacy of the former economic policy.

The speaker emphasized that, in the conditions of the prevailing imbalance between demand and supply in the investment sphere, the automatic increase of noncentralized capital investments funded from economically accountable sources will lead to a fresh boom in incomplete construction projects, uncontrollable redistribution of material resources which are already in short supply, and construction schedule overruns compounded by the multitude of construction projects. The initial capital is "consumed" while investment appetites grow! Maybe these alleged revenue funds should be channeled directly to make up for any lost circulating capital? This would make it possible to do away with enterprises' artificial money demand for investments.

Our economy has a mass of problems, Academician S.S. Shatalin, department chief at the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics and Scientific and Technical Progress Forecasting Institute, said at the beginning of his speech. It would, however, be wrong if we were to take fright, halt, and backtrack. This would be the end. It may be difficult and hard, but there is no need to panic. Today we have a normal [normalnoye] and smart [umnoye] government, normal deputies, normal scientists, and a talented people.

I see nothing frightening in social-democracy. I think that the party, when it was known as the Russian

Social-Democratic Workers Party, was in no way worse than when it was known as the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) or the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks). There is no need for anyone to campaign for socialism, our people have achieved socialist renewal through their suffering.

There is no need to hold private ownership as a bogey, either. There is nothing frightening in it, either. But it should not be promoted today as a program task. After all, the emission of shares will also result in the emergence of private property. It is necessary to skillfully combine these relations.

The speaker touched on the question of cooperatives. I have devoted much energy earlier, he said, to their revival. Sufficient wisdom was found to recreate the cooperative system, but we are actually doing everything to do away with it again. It would be proper to organize both supplies and taxation in such a fashion as to ensure that the cooperative system exists according to the civilized world's laws. At present, however, it is exacting monopoly-speculative payments from us. Yes, speculators must be caught and severely punished, but there is no need to suspect everyone and close down cooperatives altogether. There is no point in punishing the cooperative system for the state sector's misfortunes, the prime need is to improve this sector.

I am against "nomenklatura" economy and ownership. Business, including socialist business, obeys the laws of economics, the market, and the state. The production and social infrastructure and really unique projects must be under the state's jurisdiction (at all levels of the national economic hierarchy). All of our state's links must preserve the natural and ecological potential and regulate the finance and credit system whose foundation ought to be provided by the Ministry of Finance and the USSR State Bank.

The problem of regional economic accountability. It is still awaiting solution. I am altogether at a loss to imagine how Moscow, for example, could be switched to it. The Council of Ministers should not worry about all enterprises, let the market take care of them. Let the government worry about strategy, something which it has fortunately been doing recently.

And one last point. Mikhail Sergeyevich, we are gradually sacrificing basic [fundamentalnyy] science primarily to wages policy in this sphere. Forgetting about basic science would mean committing strategic suicide.

The floor was given to USSR People's Deputy N.P. Shmelev, doctor of economic sciences and chief of department at the USSR Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute. The speaker believes that the ruble must do the work, since the entire system is based on the ruble. An enormous mass of money has accumulated over the last few years, and something must be done with it. It is necessary either to achieve a 10-fold increase in the supply of goods needed by people or find some other method to soak up this money from them. In brief, the speaker said, in order to tackle the mountain of money that has been printed, it is necessary either to confiscate this money (but will this not undermine perestroyka's base?) or to "buy" this money from the people at the lowest possible price for the state.

As regards cooperatives, the scientist noted that by no means all people working in them are thieves, there are a hundred times more thieves in the state sector. A cooperative member produces goods, renders services, and pumps money out. This sector alone could account for the money supply growth planned for next year.

Why not have the state make a pledge and tell people: Bring in your money, let us have it as an interest-free loan, and in 5-6 years you will have an apartment. You want a 10-room apartment—no problem. The roughest of estimates, the speaker emphasized, shows that if a "Housing Loan" operation in the magnitude of R75 billion were to be launched, anything between R75 billion and R100 billion could be brought into circulation. This could also include the sale of land, equipment, and so on.

Now, the speaker said, we are building plans to expand joint enterprises, and create free zones and free sectors. Maybe we should use part of our foreign currency reserves simply to hold foreign currency auctions for enterprises and for individual citizens alike? This would solve two tasks at once: We would create foreign currency without which there is no hope of success by joint enterprises and free zones, and would at the same time set in motion a "Chervonets" [Russian R10 gold coin] mechanism which would gradually squeeze the "bad" ruble out of circulation.

The rostrum was mounted by Academician I.I. Lukinov, vice president of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Academy of Sciences and director of the Ukrainian SSR Academy of Sciences Economics Institute. Now, he said, our haste to divide property is akin to a drowning person clutching at straws. This is being done without seriously working out any strategic concepts of the economic management system and without defining the possible consequences of such an action.

In this context, the speaker recalled that the Decree on Land, adopted at V.I. Lenin's initiative, envisaged the nationalization of land with simultaneous existence of different forms of economic management. It was only in the course of forcible collectivization that the form of ownership and the form of economic management were proclaimed to be two identical terms. But this is totally incorrect. There is no doubt that the time has come to do away with depersonalization and irresponsibility. I think, however, that there are no reasons to immediately embark on a division of property.

But why is the economic situation deteriorating? We were perfectly correct in criticizing and maybe even discrediting the administrative levers of management. At the same time, however, no economic methods can exist without administrative methods. What is needed is the best possible combination and rational proportion of administrative and economic methods of management. Not a single state can manage without them [both].

Our structural and investment policy has proved to be ossified. Capital investment in Group "B" has declined recently, in both absolute and relative terms. We will never fully satisfy the market, given this state of affairs. It is necessary to develop Group "B" at a faster pace. Steps are now being taken in this direction. But I do not hold too much hope of success unless we seriously implement a diversification of investment and current expenditure in Group "A" sectors. About 20 percent of the workforce at our gigantic industrial associations is underemployed. Between one-third and one-half of investments from centralized budgets must be channeled into the creation of joint production units or production units within these associations for the manufacture of consumer goods.

Touching on problems of the state budget deficit, USSR People's Deputy R.A. Otsason, doctor of economic sciences and deputy chairman of the Estonian SSR Council of Ministers, said that it can be avoided and totally eliminated provided there is no breach of an elementary rule—live within your means. In his opinion, the way out of this situation lies through the creation of a real market in the Soviet Union and the utilization of this market's laws with correct state management of economic processes. The transition to a free market itself must also be regulated to a certain extent in all of the country's regions through active development of regional economic accountability, through the regional management organs' responsibility for their region's economic development. This presupposes budget autonomy, the right to regulate financial processes, autonomy in banking affairs, regional economic mechanism, and so on. All this is possible and not dangerous for the Union. We must create a market with due consideration for all local specific features. I think that this process can be implemented only through regional economic accountability.

The existence of any economy, large or small, within a region or the union as a whole, is impossible without making the maximum use of the division of labor. So there is absolutely no need to fear that a region working on economic accountability will turn in purely on itself. This is impossible in present day conditions. The maximum development presupposes that a republic must sell its machine tools to Kazakhstan and buy something different back. That it must sell meat to Leningrad and buy machinery and so forth in return. All of world history demonstrates such a path.

Academician A.G. Aganbegyan, secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences Economics Department and rector of the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, devoted his speech to the problem of balancing the consumer market. In his words, it is in this very sphere of the economy that the fate of perestroyka is being settled now. Unless the condition of the consumer market improves in the very near future there will not be sufficient incentives for the improvement of work under any form of ownership, faith in the future will be lost, and each regional formation will try to stand apart and resolve these questions by itself—defending the ruble and strengthening the market if the central authorities are incapable of doing it. Not a single week must be lost here, because it is only with each real measure that the population will feel the improvement of the economic situation in the country. There must be an emergency program to normalize the consumer market and increase the population's level of prosperity. It must include not only the balancing of the market and real financial improvement but also a program for combating poverty and deprivation.

The first thing which must be done on the path toward a stable market, the scientist stated, is to bring surplus money into "circulation," but in such a way as to benefit the population so that it feels content. Such measures could include raising the interest rates on deposits and issuing preferential loans. This would simultaneously allay the population's fear about the monetary reform.

Another possible way to bring surplus money into circulation is to develop the construction of paid housing—a development guaranteed by money put down in advance as deposits on goods in short supply, primarily cars, as well as on garages and garden plots, together with the necessary infrastructure. The resources released by the reduction of production capital investments must be used to satisfy the population's urgent needs.

Another important task, the speaker stressed, is the struggle against the black market. Imported goods often do not reach the population, a great deal falls into the hands of speculators, and the system of distribution to enterprises, in which serious abuses have also come to light, does not help. In the scientist's opinion, the best path is the organization of trade through catalogs, with definite quotas per family. The money thus obtained must be channeled into developing the production of goods in shortest supply.

USSR People's Deputy M.A. Bocharov, director of the Butovskiy construction materials combine, joined the discussion.

As an emergency measure he proposed that groups of 30-40 people consisting of USSR People's Deputies—lawyers, economists, and political scientists—be created, that a 12-hour working day be established for them excluding Saturdays and Sundays, that they be given the necessary conditions, and that each group be given 10 days to prepare the most important laws and decisions in order that they be adopted during 1990.

Subsequently the speaker dwelled on construction problems. In his opinion, beginning 1 January next year it is necessary to clearly plan for the reorientation of production capacities, manpower, and specialists to construction in the nonproduction sphere—the construction of housing, garages, and hospitals. He supported the proposal on the possibility of selling apartments to the population, mindful of the level of apartment provision. To ensure the broader development of housing construction he recommended that the construction of industrial and scientific research facilities in Moscow be prohibited for 2-3 years.

The speech also touched on questions of credit, enterprises' provision with material resources, problems of centralized capital investments, the mechanism for entering the market, and the convertibility of the ruble.

In the speaker's opinion it is too soon to talk about regional economic accountability because we still do not have the necessary system of prices and taxes or the market. The union republics, M. Bocharov believes, must be part of the USSR. It is not advisable to splinter the union, rather it is necessary to seek ways to ensure closer unification on a solid economic basis.

Even if the impossible happened, Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor A.A. Sobchak, USSR People's Deputy and Leningrad State University [LGU] department head, noted, and all those present came to a unanimous opinion on measures to improve our economy, including its financial improvement, there is no certainty that when we implemented them there would not be unpredictable results, as has happened before.

In this connection, he went on, I should like to talk frankly about why the people are talking about indecisiveness and halfheartedness in the actions of the country's leadership. In the first place, the radical and reasonable decisions that have been taken are then effectively frustrated, and with impunity. This was the case, for example, with the 19th party conference decision on the demarcation of the functions of party, soviet, and economic organs and with the Law on the State Enterprise. We were in such haste that we introduced self-management and electivity even before the Law on the State Enterprise went into effect. Now, however, on the instruction of the Council of Ministers, they have been revoked at a number of ministries' enterprises. There were grounds for that, but the curtailment of rights already granted is arousing a very negative reaction from the population. They do not see the logic in the leadership's actions and doubt its consistency. This is dangerous for the course of perestroyka and for the prestige of the leadership and the party as a whole.

Second, there is the delaying of urgent decisions. On the one hand we hurry to create cooperatives and then to limit them. On the other, we postponed the Central Committee plenum on the nationalities question and delayed the adoption of concrete decisions and eventually after adopting a most interesting program, we considerably undermined it with the Central Committee Statement on the situation in the Baltic republics, which served to incite extreme forces. Generally speaking many questions now hinge on the nationalities question.

Clearer guidelines must be elaborated to determine which political and legislative decisions are paramount. Otherwise there is no logic in the work of the Supreme Soviet either. In trying to defuse the tension and emotions on the cooperative question, for example, we actually aroused an unhealthy interest in that problem. Despite the enforced maneuvering it is necessary to maintain a strictly commonsense line in all things. And to ensure that the people see this line being clearly maintained. After all, phenomena which are entirely incomprehensible and unknown in other countries often occur in our country, such as when strikes are instigated by politicians and state figures and enterprise directors. But a strike is not a political game and may be undertaken only for truly vital interests.

As a lawyer I understand that haste in adopting laws is harmful, but delaying them means slowing down the perestroyka processes. The laws on the press, on social organizations, on freedom of conscience, and on electoral law are necessary. The question of a new union treaty must be resolved. Among the economic measures the Law on Ownership is paramount. A state economic program must be introduced. We must resolutely stop wasting money.

USSR People's Deputy A.S. Samsonov, general director of Moscow's No 1 Watch and Clock Plant, dwelt in his speech on the economic problems of the industrial enterprise. There has been much talk here, he noted, about necessary changes to the economic mechanism, but for some reason little has been said about how to use what has been achieved to raise labor productivity and how to ensure that it does not fall behind the growth in wages. Characterizing his own enterprise's activity, the speaker said that the plant, which fulfilled the last 5-year plant target with difficulty, is now on the verge of almost doubling the production of timepieces and mechanisms, 80 percent of which will go for export, without increasing retail and wholesale prices by a single kopek. At the same time labor productivity is increasing by 90 percent, profits by more than three times, and economic incentive funds by more than double.

I am citing these figures, the director said to show that the existing potential, if used rationally, is quite sufficient to ensure normal working. The question hinges on the shortage of competent cadres and really professional managers. At our plant a system of management arose which we have no qualms about calling an administrative command one. It was essentially thanks to it that the necessary production discipline was established at the enterprise, but on the other hand the possibility exists to determine absolutely democratically the competence of the people whom we are now placing in charge of a particular production unit.

The speaker noted that there must be no vacillation or failure to finish what we have begun or to examine what we have achieved by the adoption of particular decisions. The enterprise must be free to act in everything which can help increase labor productivity, improve the quality of output, and reduce its prime cost. The question of ownership has become aggravated largely because productivity today has no reliable protection from unqualified external interference. This is the nub of the problem, not ownership as such. The additional product must be used by the producer himself, whether that producer be a worker, a farmer, or a labor collective.

It infuriates me, the speaker said in conclusion, when we begin bowing down to the West and assert that we cannot come close to the level of any Western businessmen in our particular sector of work. I cannot accept that. We are looking for ways to achieve further development and to get out of the present situation, and I am sure that we will find them.

The floor was given to USSR People's Deputy M.L. Bronshteyn, head of department at Tartu University and academician of the Estonian SSR Academy of Sciences. The speaker expressed disagreement with those who have a negative attitude to the idea of republic economic accountability and stressed that this does not mean a switch toward an economy which is turned in on itself. Separation from the union national economic complex is economic suicide. The scientist cited the example of the single European market and its regulators, which are used and implemented via market relations and whose effect is incomparably more powerful.

The basis of republic economic accountability, the scientist believes, is first and foremost the independence of enterprises. In Estonia a Law on Entrepreneurship is now being elaborated and envisages a far greater degree of independence for production collectives. Market regulators at union and republic levels and the system of the rule-of-law state are being taken into account in the process. The aim is to provide more reliable protection for the producer.

Subsequently the speaker dwelt in detail on the problems of ownership and stressed that in his opinion the land must be the property of the peoples who inhabit it.

The question being raised in the republic now, the speaker said, is that of unconditional subordination not to the bureaucrat in Moscow or Estonia but only to the laws of the market and its regulators, which have legal form on the union and republic scales. This means giving freedom to enterprises. Let them earn in any market and pay their taxes. The idea of a technopolis has originated in Tartu. Its aim is to unite science, small and medium business, and local authorities granting tax concessions and helping to develop the most up-to-date technologies. All this should be given a legal basis.

Our economic reform was not backed up by a powerful structural policy, Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences Yu.V. Yaremenko, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the Economy and Forecasting of Scientific and Technical Progress, stressed.

If we look at the history of the 12th 5-Year Plan, we can see how little we have done to increase the volume of consumer goods. Particularly of those types on which consumer guidelines are based. This means primarily modern consumer durables. It may be said that we have lost the first round in this area of structural policy. There is a danger that we could lose the next round, too.

A trend has now emerged toward increasing consumer goods production, including production in the defense complex. It seems, however, that conversion is not proceeding as well as it might. Defense ministries are clearly trying to "get off lightly": The lists of goods planned for production are meager, and there is no particular hope of reducing costs and achieving a high technical level for the goods planned for production. The technological isolation of the defense and civilian sectors of the economy is not being overcome.

Another aspect of structural policy which should be mentioned is our wasteful investment. One-half of investments are backed up by extremely low-quality equipment. This is one of the main reasons for the imbalance in the economy. Centralized measures are needed to ensure the technical reformation of the sectors producing investment output.

The implementation of the centralized principle in investment policy requires that major investment decisions be put in good order. The State Planning Committee must have the ability to oppose departmental projects which do not fit into any plan, such as the original project to build petrochemical complexes in Western Siberia. Why does this happen?

A particular sphere of structural policy is connected with the solution of the food problem.

The present state of our trade is an extremely acute problem. It is necessary to abolish our most burdensome monopoly—the exclusive economic rights in retail trade. Under the commodity circulation plan the trade network has a monopoly of all goods produced. And often it uses those rights in quite the wrong way. The reorganization of trade must not be delayed, otherwise any increase in commodity resources could be nullified. In addition to abolishing the commodity circulation plan, it presupposes creating a system of direct-sale stores, broadening contract relations between industrial and trade enterprises, increasing wages for trade workers, providing information on the supply of goods, inventing new forms of social control, and clearly much else besides.

At the comclusion of the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev said:

Comrades, the people and I present here today wish to continue this conversation. Many have not been able to speak, but we have a very great interest in that they should be able to. I think that our conversation ought to be continued. I ask my comrades to think over what has already been said, and to get a better understanding of the situation.

Today, as never before, we must prize our time. Many comrades spoke about this. And I would ask V.A. Medvedev, N.N. Slyunkov, and L.I. Abalkin to give thought right now to how to give assistance, though scientific consulations and by expert scientific examination, to the work of committees and commissions on the key problems which are now being examined in the Supreme Soviet. Because I can already see much that is important and interesting that must be immediately introduced, or at least discussed at the session. This particularly applies to questions of ownership, problems of the development of the market, and certain other problems.

We must come to the Congress of People's Deputies with a government report on measures to improve the economy, finances and the market, and clearly expound views on the 13th 5-Year Plan. While resolving current issues, we are at the same time obliged to prepare an economic program for the next 5-year plan period which must be thought out in depth and profoundly worked out. Therefore I would ask you, comrades, to form groups of scientists who would be brought into this important work. A big reserve of "scientific reliability" must be created right now for the measures being worked out. We are, after all, making momentous decisions which will determine the development of our economy for many years to come. And so it is very important now, when this groundwork is being creasted, that we should give society laws which have been comprehensively thought out. That is the first point.

Second. You could also think about this. Measures are also being worked over in the government which can be categorized as urgent: the improvement of finances and of the market, and the deepening of reform. And here too the help of scientists would be very apposite.

It would be useful, comrades, if this topic were to be taken further and concretized at our next meeting. We really cannot now study many problems thoroughly if we do not remove the acutenbess of the specific economic situation, for it has acquired such a nature today that it is having an adverse effect on the social mood in society. This, naturally, is hampering the political process and the normal course of working out and making decisions. And this is all very serious.

Therefore, I would ask you once again—both those who have already spoken at our conference, and those who are yet to speak—to think about the situation that has developed. And then all this must be systematized.

I must say that we are not at all embarrassed by the fact that we are obliged to venture to take the most radical and far-reaching steps. The chief thing is that these steps should prove to be the correct ones so that the errors which occurred in the past should not be repeated.

Now, at the stage of making crucial decisions, it is important to pool all creative efforts. Major constructive steps are needed. We are open to this, absolutely open to this. And we must all pull together. All creative potential—of politicians, economists, and all specialists—must be mobilized.

In a word, I would ask you, comrades, to submit your considerations on this score to the party Central Committee. Thoughts are needed which will make politics and practical work fecund.

And we shall continue our conversation for this.

Gremitskikh Interviewed on Perestroyka, Autonomy

AU3110083389 Vienna Television Service in German 2100 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Interview with Yuriy Gremitskikh, deputy spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry, by Hubert Nowak in Vienna on 30 October—live]

[Text] [Novak] Good evening Mr Gremitskikh, your are deputy spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry, and you are currently staying for a 5-day visit in Vienna at the invitation of the Concordia Press Club. You have just been at a banquet. Thank you very much for coming here tonight. A short time ago, in a talk with Soviet media representatives, Mikhail Gorbachev said that the situation in the country is extremely tense. He compared it with a situation in which somebody stands up to his knees in gasoline and where a single spark would suffice to start a fire. Do you see the danger that somebody might produce this spark?

[Gremitskikh] I have never heard this saying about gasoline and the spark. Nevertheless, the situation is complicated and serious. The political leadership and the people are aware of it. The political leadership demands from the people and vice versa that more resolute and consistent actions be taken in order to overcome the difficulties and to promote perestroyka in the field of economy and in political restructuring of the state and society, and also as far as relations with other countries are concerned.

[Novak] Where are the biggest problems?

[Gremitskikh] We have big problems in all sectors. If the West says ...I have heard this very often during these 5 days that I have stayed here in Vienna [sentence as heard]. I would like to stress, as I do in all discussions, that the problems and difficulties are still increasing. The question is whether we will be able to overcome this, and whether we have the strength and the sources from which we can obtain this strength. I want to emphasize that, despite all our problems, we are a very rich country. We must mobilize everything that we have, our potential of natural resources, of our soil—a sometimes very fertile soil—our intellectual potential, and also the political awareness of our people, which has already overcome worse situations and mastered greater difficulties. Moreover, we must not forget that we have a great party, which in crucial times developed a policy that helped to overcome all difficulties. If we are able to mobilize and use all this in the right way, we will be able to face and overcome all these problems.

[Novak] You said that the difficulties will get even worse. How much time does Gorbachev have left to overcome the difficulties before he might be forced to the ground by the pressure from the opposite direction? There are forces in Hungary that support early parliamentary elections because they fear that Gorbachev and his perestroyka might not even survive the coming winter.

[Gremitskikh] Firstly, we will certainly survive the coming winter—with Gorbachev as the central figure of our political leadership. I have particularly pointed out from which sources we are gaining the real strength and the confidence that, ultimately, sooner or later—we hope it will not be very late—we will overcome these difficulties. The developments in other socialist countries—in Hungary, Poland, or in the GDR—certainly also have an impact on our developments. Still, they do not constitute an obstacle that might really stop us on our road.

[Novak] Let us now turn to the conflict of nationalities. Do you think that Gorbachev underestimated these centrifugal forces?

[Gremitskikh] You know, maybe we have all underestimated these forces. There have been certain eruptions of national, but also nationalist, sentiments. The people are now thinking in more realistic terms, and they want to speed up legal activities on the basis of the CPSU's political platform concerning national questions. This means that the problem of the republics' political, economic, cultural, and other sovereignties must be developed more rapidly. If possible, the economic problems of the republics must also be solved more rapidly, and autonomy must rapidly be established for those peoples and ethnic groups that still lack such autonomy, or that no longer have it as a consequence of Stalin's policy. All this has to happen most rapidly. Faster than originally planned, a solution must also be found for the Soviet Germans.

[Novak] A last question on the situation of the Warsaw Pact. Genadiy Gerasimov, whose deputy you are in the Foreign Ministry, recently came out in favor of a new doctrine, which he dubbed the Frank Sinatra Doctrine—I Did It My Way. What he wanted to say was that each country within the Warsaw Pact is to have or will have the right to pursue its own course. In the long term or even the medium term, does this not ultimately mean the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact?

[Gremitskikh] Well, whether one calls it the Sinatra Doctrine or by another name, one must realize that there is a set state doctrine, according to which each state is to have the right to determine its relations with other states or organizations in a sovereign way. This must, of course, be based on national interests and international obligations. This may not be expressed in terms of a song by Frank Sinatra, but it corresponds to international law.

[Novak] Yet this has not always been the case in history.

[Gremitskikh] True, it has not always been the case in history. Concerning our relations with the socialist countries, we are now pursuing a course where they can make their own independent decisions. However, as I said before, even though it is a major power, the USSR must take into account national interests and international obligations, and this holds equally true for other states as well. In this respect, all countries are the same.

KGB Officials Discuss Restructuring Activities

LD3110000589 Moscow TASS in English 2353 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow October 31 TASS—KGB officials told scientists, at a meeting on Monday [30 October] in the Institute of the Far East of the USSR Academy of Sciences, about the restructuring of the activity of the State Security Committee (KGB) in the light of democratization and glasnost in the country.

Special attention is given by the leadership of the committee to informing the public about the operations of the security agency, KGB Spokesman Vladimir Strunin stressed.

The functions of the KGB are changing and priorities in its activity are being revised in line with the changes under way in the country's public life.

Thus, the 5th Directorate of the State Security Committee in charge of combatting so-called ideological subversion has been abolished. Instead, a new directorate has been set up to deal with the protection of the Soviet constitutional system.

The establishment of the new directorate is dictated by the need to protect the political, social, economic and personal rights and freedoms of Soviet citizens.

On the other hand, the involvement of the state security agencies in the struggle against organised crime, contraband, narcobusiness and industrial espionage is growing in importance.

About 80 per cent of the KGB personnel in all its operational units are currently engaged in fighting organised crime in the country.

The importance of this work is made clear by the fact that, according to latest data, five major organised groups or criminal organizations have permeated practically areas of the city life.

Groupings of this kind exist also in other cities. It was noted that presently a process of consolidation of this groups is taking place both inside the city and with other cities in the country.

Speaking about the activity of western special services against the Soviet Union, the KGB spokesman noted that the role of their agents in intelligence is number one priority.

This work is continuing unabated, indeed its activity is on the rise. Western special services are stepping up attempts at recruiting Soviet citizens. These attempts are facilitated by the expanding international contacts.

The objective of the State Security Committee in this field is to upgrade the dependability of its work to ensure the security of the state without hampering contacts that are greatly needed.

PRAVDA Editorial on 'Press Responsibility'

PM3010192389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Press Responsibility. Society's Demandingness Toward Journalists Is Growing"]

[Text] Our society is at a responsible and crucial stage. It can be said that the revolutionary transformations which began in April 1985 have now spread to all spheres of the country's life. An active role in this work on a truly large scale is played by the press, radio, and television.

Let us recall how the word "glasnost" became part of our vocabulary virtually afresh. Did everyone at the time imagine the profound influence the development of glasnost would have on the most diverse aspects of social life? The people started talking about matters which perturb them. Bluntly and frankly. At the top of their voices. The contents and appearance of the mass media started changing equally sharply, literally before our very eyes.

Today they already deserve credit for a great deal, primarily for the realistic and unembellished analysis of the most acute problems of the economy and social life. The border posts which surrounded numerous zones and persons, placing them in a state "beyond criticism" for a long time, collapsed not simply in declarations but in reality. Debates were launched on pressing questions demanding solution. Readers' and viewers' letters occupy a major position in newspapers and journals and in radio and television programs. Much has been done by the mass media to spotlight the so-called "blank spots" in our history.

Briefly speaking, much work has really been done, and this has deservedly earned people's gratitude. The press is quite different from what it was even 3-4 years ago. This is one of the vivid manifestations of perestroyka, testifying to the fruitfulness of the party's course of democratization and glasnost.

It is well known, however, that those who are entrusted with a lot are also especially answerable. While rightly noting journalists' successes, readers, audiences, and viewers have recently also expressed definite concern over some aspects of their activity. This was reflected in M.S. Gorbachev's recent meeting with mass media leaders and in his meeting with PRAVDA workers.

What is at issue in the first place? Today there is a special need to consolidate all of society's healthy forces. We are living through a difficult time. Serious difficulties can be overcome only jointly, by mobilizing and concentrating efforts on resolving the tasks that have been set. In this process the party is relying on the concept of perestroyka it has elaborated. The mass media are called upon to take guidance from the party line in ensuring the revolutionary transformation of society.

Now that the spectrum of opinions in the country is exceptionally broad, it is only natural that the press should reflect it. But this, to put it bluntly, is not enough. People also need accurate political and moral guidelines. The mass of energy which has been released thanks to the population's politicization must be channeled along constructive tracks. Much in this regard depends on the press.

Yet some press organs do not always take a principled stance in line with the party's course. We can see that real threats to perestroyka originate both from the "right" and from the "left," as it were. In their own way, both conservative "tendencies" and extreme radicalism unwilling to take objective reality into account are dangerous. Every case of bias essentially leads into a blind alley.

To top it all, we also have real excitement of passions at times, capable of confusing minds and bordering almost on panic. "I watched several Central Television programs in succession," G. Pravilenko, Captain 1st Rank, Retired, wrote to PRAVDA from Kaliningrad, "and, on my word of honor, I wanted to call out the guard. What is happening? Everything seems to be especially selected and commented on in order to generate a sense of total despair among viewers. Can it be that there is nothing nice and bright in our life any longer, nothing capable of uplifting the soul rather than poisoning it?"

A typical letter. Quite a few such letters are received nowadays by the CPSU Central Committee and the PRAVDA editorial office. In the opinion of their writers, many journalists have gotten carried away by a single color—black. No, the letter writers do not yearn for a revival of the "measured" criticism which was typical of the stagnation period. They yearn for the truth. Not biased truth, but the whole truth, so that life can be reflected in all its diversity, in its good and bad aspects alike, without exaggerations and distortions. Clean hands are needed to achieve this. There must be heartfelt concern for the cause and the country's future to achieve this. Only thus can anyone work honorably as a journalist. More than ever before, journalism today needs talented and bold people who love their people and have their sights set on the main target—to help the people live and work in conditions of revolutionary renewal.

An important question which is being raised in letters is the need to publicize more fully the best experience acquired in the process of perestroyka. Perestroyka has its devotees and its heroes who have won the sincere respect of the people by tangible, concrete deeds. After all, it is precisely concrete deeds which are valued especially highly today. Suffice it to say that in 32 oblasts of the Russian Federation the situation is changing for the better. The market is being filled with goods, and what is more, this is happening in regions where the situation was particularly strained. Many new people have assumed the leadership of labor collectives and regions, having graphically proven their worth. So why is our press not depicting them equally graphically? Labor, patriotism, and feats for the sake of the Fatherland must become the journalists' main theme. It is necessary to reconstruct in the press the character of the man of perestroyka, of man the reformer; not always an easy character, perhaps, but one who has devoted all his heart, soul, and mind to the common cause.

The leading integrating force in our society is the Party. It has already embarked on preparations for its 28th Congress. It seems that it has been generally recognized now that its life and work also needs to be renewed. However, renewal does not mean disintegration, as certain destructive forces would have it. People want the problems and experience of party life to occupy much more space in the press and are themselves seeking to play a more active part in the discussion of ways of restructuring the party. It is important, especially during the period of preparations for the congress, to provide both communists and nonparty people with broader opportunities for this. Let there be a clash and comparison of opinions, thoughts, and proposals as long as they benefit rather than damage the cause. Truth is born out of honest disputes.

There is also increasing interest in society in the upcoming elections to republic and local organs of power. We are entering a major political campaign in which the press, it goes without saying, cannot remain on the sidelines. What is more, to a certain extent it is called upon to set the tone, to contribute to the formation of soviets which will in all respects be equal to the emands of the times.

So, journalists' responsibility today is exceptionally great. Special balance and absolute truthfulness, an exacting critical analysis, and constructiveness are demanded from them. The question has been raised of establishing in party committees a system for day-to-day communication and work with journalists and mass media leaders.

It is worth recalling a highly topical thought of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary: A newspaper must not be transformed into someone's fiefdom. The press is a public concern and it must serve society. Society is now steering the course of perestroyka and renewal. Our press must also fully serve this purpose.

As for PRAVDA, this is precisely how we understand our task, and PRAVDA journalists will spare no effort in order to discharge it to the best of their ability.

PRAVDA's Frolov Meets Foreign Journalists

PM3110103189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Oct 89 p 4

[Report by TASS correspondent: "Meeting with PRAVDA"]

[Text] On 30 October a meeting took place at the PRAVDA editorial office between its chief editor, I.T. Frolov, and foreign journalists, at the latter's request.

Frolov stressed that the nature of the items published in PRAVDA in the immediate future will largely be determined by the tasks of preparing for the 28th CPSU Congress and elections to the local soviet. The newspaper's pages will be submitted for discussion and the broad comparison of viewpoints on specific problems of the renewal of society and the party. Party-mindedness and the desire for the truthfulness and accuracy of the printed word will remain the basis of the activity of the journalists' collective. The importance of these criteria was also mentioned during M.S. Gorbachev's recent frank and comradely talk with PRAVDA journalists.

I.T. Frolov answered numerous questions from the foreign journalists. Considering their wishes, it has been decided to make these meetings regular events.

Says PRAVDA To Adopt New Style

AU3110093789 Paris AFP in English 0922 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, Oct 31 (AFP)—The Soviet Communist Party daily PRAVDA should adopt a politically centrist approach to reporting the news and should be "serious" and "honest," the paper's new editor in chief said here.

Speaking at a news conference Monday, Ivan Frolov said PRAVDA should not be "leftist or rightist, conservative or radical" but should instead try to be straightforward in its reporting.

Mr. Frolov, an advisor to President Mikhail Gorbachev since 1987, was named last week to replace Viktor Afanasyev as the party daily's top editor. Mr. Afanasyev was opposed to the reforms under way in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Frolov said PRAVDA would place a higher priority on analysis than on factual news reporting and would concentrate on "in-depth" explanations of stories such as why so many people are deserting the party.

He said that the Lithuanian Communist Party, for example, would be permitted to express its opinions on greater autonomy from the Soviet Party in the paper's columns, but added that the Party as a whole should not become divided along republican lines.

That does not mean communist parties in various Soviet republics cannot act "in a more autonomous manner," he said.

He said the paper's journalists were all highly qualified and that he saw no need to replace senior cadres, as some of the daily's previous editors had done.

PRAVDA's circulation, like that of many other official Soviet publications, has fallen sharply in recent years, but Mr. Frolov said he did not want "to dramatize the situation."

He said the paper would henceforth provide better coverage of the activities in various departments of the Central Committee and would be an exclusive source of reporting on many major party decisions.

PRAVDA will also carry more interviews with senior Soviet officials as well as essays on Communist Party history.

Mr. Frolov said he had been very well acquainted with a number of "intellectuals" linked to the 1968 "Prague Spring" of social and cultural liberalization, but had not known the movement's leaders such as Alexander Dubcek.

Baltic Discussions on Banks, Currency Cited

PM3010194189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 31 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by own correspondent Leonid Levitskiy under the general heading "Direct Line": "Republic Money?"]

[Text] Tallinn— Estonia's Sunday papers carried a report on a conference of Baltic republic specialists on banking and monetary systems. The three-point protocol was signed by R. Otason, leader of an ad hoc scientific collective of the Estonian SSR Economic Institute; V. Prozor, chief of department of the Latvian Council of Ministers; K. Prunskene, leader of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers Economic Reform Commission; and chairmen of republic banks. These are to present to the republic governments a memorandum on urgent measures concerned with organizing the banking business and creating monetary systems in conditions of the republics' economic autonomy; to continue consultations on the principles of banks' activity and introducing republic money; and to ensure the issuing of bank notes, securities, and coins.

Are these routine economists' ideas intended for discussion or a practical step toward republics' having their own money and banks? Judging by the calls to our correspondents' center, readers have interpreted the protocol and memorandum as news of the impending birth of the Estonian krona. Everyone knows perfectly well that R. Otason is first deputy chairman of the Estonian Council of Ministers and that K. Prunskene is first deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Council of Ministers. They are USSR people's deputies. Moreover, republic leaders recently signed an agreement on a Baltic republics' common market. And the memorandum says outright that "The conference deems it impossible and intolerable to carry out major reforms (on prices, taxes, wages, and so forth) without solving the aforementioned questions."

Division of Lithuanian Youth Leagues Urged

PM3010112189 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 89 p 2

[Report by A. Bochurov, S. Vdovin, and A. Zinchenko, members of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee: "...The Plenum Is to Decide"; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The Eighth All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee Plenum 3 months ago set up a commission to study the problems that arose in connection with the holding of the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress, which proclaimed the re-creation of a Lithuanian Communist Youth League independent of the center. The commission has completed its work. Its final document will be submitted to Central Committee members at the next All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee plenum, which will begin its work tomorrow. Our correspondent asked A. Bochurov, S. Vdovin, and A. Zinchenko, members of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee and members of that commission, to share information on the commission's work and on some of its conclusions.

We would like to make things clear right away. Our commission embarked on its work with no prejudice whatsoever, without directives as to the conclusions which we finally reached, and without a desire to hurt or offend our Lithuanian comrades in any way. It was created in an enterprising way from among those Central Committee members who wished to understand for themselves what is happening to the Lithuanian Komsomol. Initially, the commission members were not unanimous in their views and expressed different and at times opposite viewpoints. Our final document is the result of discussions and compromises, the result of collective work by all the commission members. And one more preliminary remark of, in our view, considerable importance. The question of the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress was examined at the previous All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee plenum, but, after detailed discussion, no decision was adopted then. Although there was a draft of a corresponding resolution and demands from certain Central Committee members for a decision to be adopted without delay. A refusal to draw hasty conclusions is in no way a show of weakness or unpreparedness by the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee to express a principled stand. On the contrary, by setting up a special commission, the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee plenum once again took a respectful attitude to the opinion of Lithuania's Komsomol members and the congress decisions.

Now about the way we worked. Archive documents of party and Komsomol organs, the materials of the 22d

Lithuanian Komsomol Congress, and a large amount of historical literature were placed at the commission's disposal. But meetings and talks with Komsomol members were the chief source of our conclusions. It was important for us to obtain the widest possible range of opinions, and so we talked not only with Lithuanians but also with Russians, Belorussians, Poles, and young people of other nationalities and met not only in Vilnius but also in other cities in the republic. Our interlocutors were students, workers, servicemen, party and Komsomol veterans... All this formed the basis for the conclusions. It is up to the 9th All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee Plenum whether or not it agrees with them, but we are ready to uphold our collective viewpoint with specific facts and with documents to hand. What kind of conclusions are they?

First. The congress essentially set up a new organization, although the delegates had been elected from Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol organizations. No decision was taken to disband the Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol, and the future status of members of the organization disagreeing with the documents adopted was not stipulated. In a number of republic Komsomol organizations there have been statements of reluctance to join the Lithuanian Communist Youth League, with a demand for membership of the Lithuanian Lenin Komsomol to be preserved. We are now being accused of incitement to split. So, by recognizing the right of young people to be part of the Communist Youth League, must we brush aside those who want to be members of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol? This is why we believe that the 22d congress decisions could lead to the emergence in the republic of two youth organizations calling themselves Communist and give rise to confrontation that no one needs.

Second. The reason for recreating the Lithuanian Communist Youth League, recorded in the congress documents, strikes us as questionable. Let us remind you: There was talk of restoring historical justice with regard to the Lithuanian Komsomol, which supposedly was forcibly joined with the All-Union Lenin Komsomol in 1940. True, the archives contain no written statements containing a request from the Lithuanian Komsomol to be admitted to the all-union organization. But this attests to a violation of procedural factors, nothing more. This fact cannot be a basis for concluding that the voluntary principle was violated or that there was no wish to join the All-Union Lenin Komsomol. Many documents indicate the contrary. Veterans' memoirs, articles from those years, and speeches by Lithuanian Komsomol leaders both in 1940 and in subsequent years attest that Lithuanian Komsomol members considered the fact of joining the All-Union Lenin Komsomol an event of great importance. The decision to admit the Lithuanian Communist Youth League was essentially a restoration of the situation which took shape in 1919, when the Lithuanian Communist Youth League became part of the Russian Communist Youth League.

We also heard the opinion that the Lithuanian Komsomol's joining the All-Union Lenin Komsomol was almost a direct consequence of the shameful—in our view—"Ribbentrop-Molotov" pact. Whatever our attitude now to that document, it is a mistake to trace back to it all subsequent events without exception. We must not mechanically transfer our assessments, our knowledge, and our indignation into the heads of our forebears and then judge their actions. No, we believe that the Lithuanian Komsomol members of 1940 were convinced of the correctness of their choice. Then came Stalinism, repression, arrests, and mass deportation. But that was later. And this "later" must not be moved about in history for present-day political purposes.

Third. Let us disengage ourselves from history and, accepting the re-creation of the Lithuanian Communist Youth League as a fait accompli, see what has followed it. We wanted to understand: Has the substance of Komsomol life changed with the change of signboard on the Lithuanian Central Committee building? Because the new league's leadership argued for the congress decisions in just this way: If we rename the organization and redefine its relationship with Moscow, we will also work differently. Our work on the commission has convinced us that this is far from the case.

Of course, given the political situation in which a considerable section of the population lives for the idea of national sovereignty, the step of separation from the All-Union Lenin Komsomol struck the leaders of the Lithuanian Komsomol as very attractive. And it seemed that this could restore the organization's shaken prestige and somehow stabilize the overall crisis processes. That is, reasonable political pragmatism seemed to be apparent behind all this. But what happened in the end? By substituting one kind of centralism for another, the leaders of the Lithuanian league have, in our view, not yet managed to make the Komsomol either more attractive to young people or more authoritative. Pragmatism is turning into opportunism [konyunktura]... We have observed confusion and a vagueness of position in a certain section of Komsomol cadres and the aktiv, who are making their further actions dependent on how the political situation in the republic shapes up in the future.

In saying all this, it is possible to assume that someone will want to portray our commission's conclusions as the personal opinion of a handful of stagnationists, conservatives, and centrist apparatchiks. That is all to easy for people reluctant to indulge in polemics. But the situation in Lithuania is being analyzed in other republics and in kray and oblast organizations. Here, for example, is what T. Saal writes in the newspaper MOLODEZH ESTONII, analyzing the Rules of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol and the Lithuanian Communist Youth League and the draft Rules of the Estonian Lenin Komsomol in the article "Light at the End of the Komsomol Tunnel": "No one uninvolved can be a judge. But can a Communist youth organization fail to acknowledge Communism as one of the political aims of its activity and Marxism-Leninism as its ideology?" I believe that, if it is to be Communist, socialist, or democratic, it must be so entirely. And then it will be clear to people what a particular political force wants to do in this world. There is, even so, a lack of confidence, and now a Communist Youth League has emerged in Lithuania which has democratic socialism as its chief aim and which does not want to recognize Marxism-Leninism." It is hard to disagree with this viewpoint. How are we to get out of this situation? Being convinced that the answer can be found only by working together, we proposed to the Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee plenum possible options for resolving the problems which arise for the period through the 21st All-Union Lenin Komsomol Congress. The chief of these is to avoid the emergence of two Komsomol organizations in the republic and the division of league members on ethnic grounds, and not to set them against each other. This, in our view, would make it possible to resolve such a fundamental question as the participation of Lithuanian Komsomol members in the preparation and work of the 21st All-Union Lenin Komsomol Congress as delegates. The Lithuanian Communist Youth League Central Committee plenum rejected the compromises proposed by the commission. In this situation we believe that there must be no further delay in adopting a decision. We believe that the All-Union Lenin Komsomol Central Committee plenum resolution should reflect the fact that the unilaterally adopted decisions of the 22d Lithuanian Komsomol Congress run counter to the league's basic internal norms and should state that a new youth organization has been created which does not belong to the All-Union Lenin Komsomol. Measures should be taken to ensure that in the course of reregistration members of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol have full freedom of expression and the opportunity to maintain their regulation ties with the All-Union Lenin Komsomol. But life will not stop there. So it is essential to seek ways to collaborate and cooperate.

Lithuanian Monitoring Service Featured

LD3010204389 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 29 Oct 89

[Feature by Journalist Rimas Pleikys, described as an active DX'er, on the Lithuanian Radio Monitoring Service, including passages by Antanas Simkunas, head of the Lithuanian Radio foreign service; Pleikys and Simkunas speak in vernacular with superimposed English translation; date and place of interview not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Pleikys] Today I would like to speak on the topic that has never been touched, either by radio Vilnius foreign service or the home service of Lithuania. (?For long) decades before glasnost this subject was a taboo. It was banned by censorship. I have in mind here the Lithuanian Radio Monitoring Service.

Up to quite recently the texts prepared by this service have been considered classified, or available only to authorized persons. The foreign radio broadcast bulletin was available to only a small group of selected people, such as the Lithuanian Government leaders, the Communist Party bosses, and the head of the national radio, television, and editors-in-chief of some of the newspapers.

An interesting paradox. The Communist government took care to jam the foreign radio stations while the bosses themselves, unwilling to expose their tender ears to the noises created on the air, preferred to read comfortably the next morning the corresponding texts printed overnight. They were interested to know what their socalled ideological (?expatriates) in the West were saying about them.

Now the position is changing. The bulletin of the Lithuanian Radio Monitoring Service is already available to every editor at the television and radio and to every journalist in general. The possibility to make it available to every citizen is under consideration. And so I invite you to listen to my interview with Antanas Simkunas, head of the Lithuanian Radio foreign service. The matter is that the monitoring service is part of this editorial office at present:

[Simkunas] The aim of this service is to gather information transmitted by foreign radio stations. Previously, this kind of information was not accessible to all, while now those recordings are indispensable indeed.

All the journalists and commentators want to know exactly what foreign radio stations say about Lithuania. This information is no longer banned. Anyone is welcome to make use of it, to quote any statements, and so on. In the period of stagnation getting foreign news was looked down upon. Nowadays, our politicians and public figures have relations with foreign correspondents and supply information to them.

Here in Lithuania, interesting events are under way, and that accounts for the great amount of attention showed by foreign radio stations to Lithuania and other Baltic republics. One can often hear Western radio stations quoting reports coming from Radio Vilnius. By the way, Lithuanian people, too, are interested to hear news from abroad. Going by the sociological research questionnaires, 10 percent of the Lithuanian population pointed to the Western radio stations as their chief source of information.

[Pleikys] I'd like to make a comment at this point. Ten percent means at least that every one out of 10 adult citizens of Lithuania finds the information coming from foreign radio stations most reliable. On the basis of it they formed clear picture of what is really going on in the world. But the number of citizens who are regular listeners of foreign radio stations is still larger. I enquired of Radio Vilnius monitoring chief what stations are controlled by our monitoring service:

[Simkunas] In the first place it is those stations which broadcast in the Lithuanian language and which devote a great deal of attention to Lithuania. These are the Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, Radio Vatican. In addition to these we monitor the Russian broadcasts of some big radio stations such as BBC, Radio Liberty, Deutsche Welle, Radio Sweden.

[Pleikys] At the end of our talk Antanas Simkunas recalled that the Lithuanian Radio Monitoring Service was used to intimidate and blackmail the initiators and the first activists of the Lithuanian Reform Movement, Sajudis:

[Simkunas] This (?banning variant) was overstepped when the people of Sajudis began to speak to Lithuania on foreign radio stations, because at that time it was still forbidden to express one's views freely and to speak of one's activities openly here in Lithuania. Some of the government officials made an attempt to blackmail the persons who had dared to speak on the Western radio stations.

[Pleikys] Up to now the bulletin of foreign radio broadcasts has been available only to a narrow circle of government functionaries and professional journalists, but at present this bulletin of foreign news is going to be printed in several thousands copies, so that any Lithuanian citizen may subscribe to it. Or maybe this bulletin will reach the reader in a different way, namely as a regular supplement of the weekly Kalba Vilnius, of the Lithuanian television and radio. This has still to be edited. And now some more technical information about the Vilnius monitoring service, which I suppose may be interesting to our DX'ers:

The monitoring room is located about 10km to the southeast of Vilnius, not far from the Nemiezis settlement. I paid a visit to that place myself and had a look at the field of antennae. There are eight antennae in all—the chief and largest one of the Yagi type is directed toward the southwest. There are two horizontals and five [word indistinct] shortwave aerials. The communication receivers used are Soviet-made. They are called (?Bond 215). No recording is made at the station. The information is transmitted by an underground communication cable to the State Television and Radio Committee. Here it is recorded with the help of Hungarian-made tape recorders, (?5TM 600). The recording speed is 15 revolutions per second. The recordings are deciphered and radio information bulletins are compiled by (?TASS staff workers). So much about the Radio Vilnius Monitoring Service.

Independent Radio Station Set Up in Vilnius

LD3010190889 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 28 Oct 89

[From the "DX" Program]

[Excerpts] I would like to begin this program with chronologically the latest events on the broadcasting scene here in Lithuania. On Friday, 20 October, at 1814 UCT [Universal Coordinated Time], the listeners in Vilnius and the vicinities could hear the unheard-of sounds on 73.35 mhz FM. This was, in fact, the very first signal originating from the studio of the independent local radio station M-1 here in Vilnius. It proved that the link between the studio and transmitter was established. However, the studio itself is not yet equipped and regular broadcasts will probably not be inaugurated before late December. The station management holds out a quiet hope to be ready with the opening program on Christmas.

And while we are concerned about free radio here in the capital, people in the provincial town of Siauliai have made a step toward free television. On 19 October the first 90-minute local television broadcast went on the air in this north Lithuanian town. UHF channel 22 was used; that is the same channel on which the Second Program of the central television from Moscow is relayed. The local transmission was broadcast at 2115 just after the closedown of the central television. The program included interviews with famous personalities of the town, a report from the local prison, a feature about the Siauliai military base, and so on. A body called Experimental Youth Studio of Siauliai was set up to produce the programs, which, by the way, will be financed by the Youth Center of Scientific and Technical Creation and are supposed to go on the air fortnightly. [passage omitted]

Finally, we've got some more details about the transmitter used to relay the Lithuanian Radio home service from Moscow. This is the former jamming transmitter adopted for shortwave broadcasting. The site is located just outside Moscow and borders on the eastern suburbs of the city. The power is low, only 10 kws. Second and third-class telephone lines are being used to feed the program to the transmitter so the low-frequency response is just enough for speech transmissions. The antenna of the transmitter beams the signal in two directions simultaneously, east and northwest. That's why the reception conditions are different even within Moscow itself. For example, in the southern parts of the city, on 6010 khz interference from the cochannel 240 kw Radio Moscow transmitter in Krasnoyarsk is observed. And the reception on 9675 khz in the evening hours is impossible due to interference from strong European stations.

Pavel Mikhaylov, editor of Radio Moscow DX programs in Russian, who sent us this information, adds that the relayed transmissions of Latvian and Estonian home services originate from the same site, too.

To end the program, I would like to inform you that from 5 November Radio Vilnius will change the shortwave frequencies of its broadcasts in English at 2300 and in Lithuanian at 0100. According to the telex received from the USSR Telecommunications Ministry, the new frequencies will be:

To the east coast of northern America: 7400, 9700 khz.

The west coast of North America: 15180, 15455 and 17665 khz.

All these frequencies may also be received in other parts of the world.

The European frequencies of 666 and 6100 khz remain unchanged. [passage omitted]

Reportage on Ukraine Supreme Soviet 10th Session

Deputies Remarks, Debate Noted

LD3010185989 Kiev in English to North America 0030 GMT 28 Oct 89

[Excerpts] [Presenter] We present a report from the 10th session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation. The floor of the session was given to first secretary of the Crimean regional party committee, deputy (Mykola Bahrov) who informed the deputies that following the inquiry of the Crimean Party Committee and regional soviet, as well as a number of people's deputies and the public of the Crimea, the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a decision to redesign the Crimean nuclear power plant, under construction now as a workshop-training center. Possibilities of using natural gas at this plant are being studied.

A telegram that arrived from Armenia has been cited at the session. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Armenia, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of that republic, on behalf of their citizens, expressed deep gratitude to the people of the Ukraine for their disinterested internationalist aid and fraternal support in Armenia's time of need. [passage omitted]

And yet the main attraction of the session participants was centered today at discussing the draft laws on changes and amendments to the Constitution of the Ukrainian SSR, as well as the elections of people's deputies of the Ukraine and deputies of local soviets. During a recess we took a poll among the deputies on their views on the draft legislation regarding the languages in the Ukraine. [passage omitted]

And here are the views of (Roman Fedoriv) from Lvov: We do not need two state languages, says (Roman Fedoriv). The Ukrainian language is sufficient. The Ukrainian language must be protected. The idea of two state languages, Russian included, is backed up by some people. Regrettably this thought was expressed by Mikhail Gorbachev, who I very much respect and will support, but I believe that he expressed this idea by mistake. Bilingualism in the Ukraine will lead to a situation when the Ukrainian language will be downtrodden and turned into (?just) a (?household) language, said (Roman Fedoriv). [passage omitted]

Sharp debates also took place during the sittings at the session. Deputy Leonid Kravchuk, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine, said the following:

[Begin Kravchuk recording in Ukrainian fading into English translation] Is it worthwhile to make Ukrainian a state language? Everything here is very simple. If our society was developing in a natural way, according to laws of humanism, justice, then we today would probably not have to raise the question of making Ukrainian a state language. The French have no need to raise the question of making French a state language. Our language became ill and we must see to it that it gets well. The law is directed at curing our Ukrainian language and creating all prerequisites for other languages, for their interaction under conditions of friendship and fraternity. I would like that we adopt this law today, unanimously, and after that we could tell the people that we adopted this law because it was humane, because it corresponded to the interests of all nations, and we shall be putting this law into practice, building schools, training teachers, writing books, and creating all conditions. We must show an example and adopt this law. We must adopt it today, on the eve of the anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, when implemented into life [word indistinct], and also on the anniversary date of the reunification of Ukrainian lands into the Ukrainian Socialist State. Let's show an example of unity and fraternity, friendship in this hall. [end recording]

And here is what deputy Yuriy Mushketyk, chairman of the Ukraine's Writers' Union, said:

[Begin Mushketyk recording in Ukrainian fading into English translation] Everything created by nature is expedient, so it is a great misfortune when a river or a forest disappears. But when a language is about to disappear it is a universal catastrophe. The nation stands on the edge of an abyss and we have to save our language by legal means, so as not to let it disappear. The Russian writers who live in the Ukraine have comprehended this very well. At their meeting they unanimously spoke out for granting Ukrainian the status of the state language. Some people think that it will be a kind of Ukrainianization, but it is entirely wrong. Could it sound right—the Russification of Russia, for example? Or the Polonization of Poland? The thing is that it is simply necessary to return the Ukrainian language to its natural status, to prevent it from destruction. We are interested not only about the Ukrainian language. Other languages on the territory of the Ukraine have also undergone a considerable, and in some cases, irreparable corrosion. [pasage omitted] All of us are somehow guilty for that. So we have to care about protection and development of the languages of the people of those nationalities who live on the territory of our republic. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Today, the session participants adopted the law on changes and amendments to the Ukrainian SSR Constitution, on legal guarantee of the reform of the representative bodies of state power in the republic, and on the elections of people's deputies of the Ukraine and deputies of local soviets. Tomorrow the session will continue its work.

Resolutions, Elections Set

LD3010185689 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 28 Oct 89

[Excerpts] The 10th session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] of the 11th convocation ended its work today in Kiev. As we have reported, yesterday, after lengthy and sharp debates, the deputies adopted the law on changes and amendments to the republic's constitution and the law on elections of people's deputies of the Ukrainian SSR and deputies to the local soviets. At this morning's session, a resolution was adopted on scheduling elections for Sunday, 4 March 1990; 450 constituencies are being organized on the Ukraine's territory. The composition of the central electoral commission was approved.

Vitaliy Boyko, first deputy minister of justice, was elected chairman of this commission. At the proposal of several soviets of people's deputies, a resolution was adopted to hold elections, as an experiment, in separate local soviets of people's deputies of the republic according to territorial and production constituencies. These elections are scheduled for 25 March next year.

The deputies also began voting on the adoption of the law on languages in the Ukrainian SSR. Debates took place on almost every article. In part, the points of view of Kolkhoznik Vasyl Hurtovyy from Kirovograd region, and Konstantyn Sytnyk, academician of the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences, as to the time limits of this law, were opposed. [passage omitted]

After introducing a number of amendments and proposals, the law of the Ukrainian SSR on languages was adopted in full. The provisions of the law give Ukrainian the status of a state language, leaving to Russian the status of a language of interethnic communication. The law also provides real guarantees for the free development and usage of languages of all nations residing on the territory of the republic.

Then the delegates adopted a law on endorsing the decrees of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on introducing changes and amendments to certain legislative acts, as well as decisions on changes in the composition of the government of the republic, the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Court, the People's Control Committee of the Ukraine, and others. Replies to deputies' questions were heard and corresponding decisions made.

With that, the session of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet completed its work.

A Radio Kiev reporter asked Valentyna Shevchenko, chairperson of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to briefly sum up the results of this session's work. Here is what she said:

[Begin Shevchenko recording] I believe that we have made the right decision to give live coverage to the sittings of the Ukrainian SSR Supreme Soviet session. By doing this, we have provided the entire Ukrainian people with the opportunity to watch how the republic's parliament works, what stand is taken by one or another deputy, and in what way the deputies defend their positions. The session has fully reflected all the processes which are today taking place in our society: the process of glasnost, democratization, and pluralism of ideas. [end recording]

At the final session many deputies received answers to their questions. Among other things, while answering questions on the state of things in the zone of the Chernobyl AES, Vitaliy Masol, chairman of the Ukraine SSR Council of Ministers, said that since the breakdown about 92,000 inhabitants have been evacuated to other areas. Much has been done to protect the basin of the River Dnepr from eventual radioactive pollution. A lot of deactivation work has been carried out. However, proper results have not been achieved everywhere. Therefore, a decision has been made to resettle an additional number of villages in Narodichi rayon, Zhitomir oblast, and Polasskoye rayon, Kiev oblast. The resettlement has already started. Hundreds of families have already arrived in southern rayons of Kiev oblast.

The deputies passed a decision charging the republic's government with implementing additional measures to improve the supply of goods and medical services in northern rayosn of Kiev, Zhitomir, and Chernigov oblasts.

The deputies noted the explanations given by Mykhaylo Potebenko, deputy attorney of the Ukraine SSR, concerning the events in Lvov on 1 October this year. They also heard about these events from Rostyslav Bratun, USSR people's deputy.

With this the session of the Ukraine SSR Supreme Soviet ended.

Pavlychkov Wins Kalush By-Election

LD1810092089 Kiev in Ukrainian to North America 2200 GMT 16 Oct 89

[Text] By-elections have taken place in the Kalush territorial constituency, Ivano-Frankovsk oblast. They were caused by the resignation of the previous deputy, Yuriy Matveyev, in connection with his appointment as USSR state arbiter.

Five candidates ran for the place at the USSR People's Congress. Dmytro Pavlychko, well known public figure and poet, is the winner.

'Green World' Movement Founded in Ukraine

LD3010231889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Kiev, 30 Oct—TASS correspondent Tatyana Larina reports:

The world in caring hands and the slogan 'Survival, Democracy, Humanism' are the symbols of the Ukrainian ecological association 'Zelenyy Svit' ('Green World'), which has been established here. Its founding congress took place on Sunday in Kiev, the capital of the republic.

"An event has taken place which was so long awaited by people who are concerned about the ecological situation in the republic," Yuriy Shcherbak, the association's chairman and a USSR people's deputy, told a TASS correspondent. "Our informal organization came about 2 years ago. At that time we were only a few strong. But now the congress has shown that hundreds of thousands of people profess the ideas being put forward by the association. Any ecological associations may take part in its work—small ones protecting a copse or a stream, and large ones opposing the construction of a nuclear electric power station. Organizations campaigning for the purity of the atmosphere in the republic's industrial centers have also joined 'Zelenyy Svit'."

A charter, a program, a package of resolutions, and an appeal to the Ukrainian Government were adopted at the congress, and the board of the association were elected. Taking part in the work of the congress were delegates from various ecological organizations from all regions of the republic, representatives of the 'Greenpeace' organization from Great Britain, and the 'Greens' from Holland, the CSSR, and Sweden.

Moldavian Green Movement Founded 29 Oct

LD3010170589 Moscow TASS in English 1652 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Kishinev October 30 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Popov:

Actiunae Verde is Moldavian for the green movement that was launched at a Sunday conference in the republic. The newly established movement has united environmentalist clubs, cooperatives and societies that sprang up in rural districts and towns across this republic in the southeast of the Soviet Union.

The rules of movement describe it as a self-governing public organisation whose objective is to help people exercise their right to a healthy environment.

The green movement arose as an active public response to the alarming environmental situation in the region. Although meant as an alternative to the official nature protection structures, the movement does not consider confrontation with ministries, departments and enterprises inevitable.

In fact, just the contrary. The greens believe that only by pooling efforts can the environmental crisis be overcome to make the environment more healthy.

The Moldavian movement views itself as part of the world green movement. Its objectives include the creation of an all-embracing environmental system in the republic and the entire country and the averting of environmental disasters, including destruction of landscapes, ecosystems and monuments of culture.

The Moldavian Actiunae Verde maintains contacts with all the green movements in the Soviet Union and national chapters of the International Greenpeace Organisation in West Germany, the United States and other countries.

Moldavian writer George Malarchuk was elected president of the Moldavian green movement.

Correction to 'Moldavian Presidium on Draft Laws'

LD3010134789

The following correction pertains to the item entitled 'Moldavian Presidium Discusses Draft Laws' which was published on page 53, column 1 of the 26 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT.

Pargraph three, sentence three should read: "...flag—the symbol spontaneously sanctioned by the People's Front—once..." (rewording);

Same paragraph, sentence four should read: "...to hold the rally in the open-air theater or at the..." (rewording).

Russian Movement Seeks 'National Consensus'

PM3110093189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Interview with A. Prokhanov, chief editor of SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA, by own correspondent Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev: "Our Association Calls for Agreement..."; date and place not specified; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] The constituent congress of full representatives of social organizations and patriotic and cultural enlightenment movements from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and a number of other union republics which have formed the "United Council of Russia" [OSR] association has been held in Moscow. More than 300 delegates and representatives took part in its work. The congress ratified the council's rules, elected the association's Coordinating Council, and adopted an "Appeal to the Peoples of Russia" and a number of resolutions.

Our correspondent met with the writer A. Prokhanov, member of the OSR Coordinating Council and chief editor of SOVETSKAYA LITERATURA.

[Pashayev] Aleksandr Andreyevich, nobody is surprised any longer about the appearance of new informal movements in our country. There are dozens, if not hundreds of them. What, in your view, has initiated this process?

[Prokhanov] We are living at a special time. In the past 70 years we have managed to create a mighty power with an unprecedented state superstructure. But we have also completely destroyed society. Our social institutions were either destroyed or ossified, bureaucratized, and turned into models, mannequins, and statues. The previous social ideology—a normative, dogmatic, and ossified ideology—did not allow any innovations to break through its impenetrable concrete edifice. And it is only now that the process of destroying obsolete structures is under way that social energies are being liberated. Ideas, interests, views, and aspirations are attracting groups and collectives and are building up communities. In their turn, these groups actively collaborate and influence each other. They are being transformed and developed. This process is natural and should continue until a complex, multifaceted, and real, rather than declared, unity based on plurality emerges. This, of course, is the ideal. If this does not happen, we will be doomed to a constant struggle that will exhaust and weaken all of us. And then instead of a new green forest there will be only a stunted sapling—a kind of declining social unit.

[Pashayev] Just what is the OSR's role in this process?

[Prokhanov] The fact is that Russia, as always, has been somewhat slow off the mark. Like a snow-covered winter crop, it awoke later than other, fast-developing, exotic plants. And for a long time it was silent. It viewed innovation with suspicion and suffered attacks and injury in silence. But the popular national Russian self-awareness has awoken. The tsar-fish [title of a Russian nationalist book by Viktor Astafyev] of "Russian ideology" has risen to the surface again after 70 years, again, because it had never actually disappeared from Russian social awareness. For many years people harpooned this fish, tried to net it, scraped off its scales, and drove it into the depths, where it hid. Now it has reemerged—not all at the same time, but in elements and fragments.

[Pashayev] I think we cannot avoid analyzing this concept of "Russian ideology."

[Prokhanov] It is an ideology which has shown itself capable of integrating an immense ethnos spread over colossal distances. With its many classes [sosloviye] and its several, so to speak, strategic development goals which the Russian people formulated throughout their huge and rich history. This category has an absolutely mundane aspect—the ethnographic and demographic aspect. It also includes forms of class distinction, ways of implementing social institutions and economic management, the principles of family and artel ethics and of the relationship between the state and the individual, the concept of power, and elements of our own culture, aesthetics, and the plastic arts. It is a huge vessel containing its own philosophy and the idea of Russian space and the Russian dream. The devastation done to this universe essentially turned an integrated picture into innumerable fragments, a fresco crumbling away after a terrible explosion. Today the task is to restore this fresco, to collect and match its details, and to arrange them into an integrated picture. And in such a way that not a single fragment disappears, becomes missing, or vanishes. And we should add to the picture and finish painting it, since history is continuing. This is the work shouldered by our association members.

[Pashayev] Just who has joined it?

[Prokhanov] There are many groups and associations in it. The ecological movement, for instance, is very strong. But Russian ecologists are not just engaged in a struggle for clean lakes and rivers. Unlike traditional "Green" movements, through their concern for our forests, rivers, and skies they are tackling the problems of people's spiritual lives and their historical morality. This is a philosophical, not just a purely practical avenue.

Or take Russian folklorists, cultural experts, and art societies. Again these are not simply systematic collectors. Through culture they arrive at something more general and propagandize the values, ideals, and traditions which from time immemorial have been characteristic of and valued by our peoples. Is not their aim—to reassemble a Russian culture that has been blown to smithereens, make it generally accessible, give it asylum, and reinstall in its native home the legacy of all the sons of Russia—a noble undertaking?

In my view, military-patriotic movements are immensely interesting. There are many of them. They include "Afghans," associations of young workers and retired veterans, and a group that is seemingly completely divorced from the Army—writers. Their activities are in general purely pragmatic—training young people for the Army. But they do not confine themselves to that. After all, to some degree the Army is also an accumulation of the Russian state ideal, the Russian ethic of service to the fatherland. It is a storehouse of our historical experience, our victories and defeats, and our dramatic path. It is a storehouse of the traditions of courage and sacrifice, of a very rich and unique culture. Suffice it to say that all the gentry had once been military men. The traditions which the Army nurtured are rooted in our immense and multifaceted past. That is, these, too, are not just movements of ex-servicemen; they are a social, spiritual, and philosophical movement.

All these and many other groups and movements which have emerged or reemerged are increasingly making their presence felt. Naturally, they try to unite and combine. They need to have a central coordinating headquarters—not an administrative headquarters, a coordinating headquarters.

[Pashayev] Is that what your association has become?

[Prokhanov] Yes. It has been formed with a view to consolidating, cooperating with, and coordinating different organizations and social movements whose activities are based on the platform of the unity of the country, popular consensus, the transformation and strengthening of the socialist fatherland, and the shaping of Soviet people's patriotic and civic awareness with a view to restoring full equal rights for the RSFSR and the Russian people with other union republics and peoples.

developing sociopolitical activeness, national self-awareness, and self-expression by the larger and smaller peoples of the USSR on the basis of the socialist, democratic, patriotic, and international ideals of a socialist system that is renewing itself.

[Pashayev] Proclaiming on the whole positive ideas and declaring their devotion to perestroyka, many movements and fronts, as we are well aware, have acted as a catalyst for opposition from considerable groups of people. Above all, along ethnic lines. Has your association been a response, a reaction in this sense?

[Prokhanov] Clearly, there is a reactive side to the movement. A side reacting to extremism, overt attacks, abuse, and insult. But this, of course, is not the main thing—it is not the fundamental thing. The movement did not emerge because of abuse; it grew out of the deepest reaches of society. If it is a response, it is a response to the havoc wrought in the past. It has no aggressive intentions. Its philosophical formula is to restore and formulate the Russian idea of acceptance and good. There is an icon of the Virgin standing with hands open wide. Her face, heart, and demeanor are open, open to everything—sunshine, prayer, and desecration. She is huge, she is holy, she is defenseless, and at the same time protected by her sanctity. This is how we want to see our movement. The ideas of openness, goodness, and a lack of aggression and expansionism were proclaimed at our congress. All these, incidentally, are historically innate in the Russian nation, which is too huge and great to harbor evil, pursue any self-seeking aims, indulge in envy, or torment itself with imaginary suspicions. Moreover, our movement is by no means exclusively Russian. Russia is multinational and international. Its representation in our council is international, too.

[Pashayev] The "Appeal to the Peoples of Russia" adopted at the constituent congress could obviously be considered the OSR's program document.

[Prokhanov] Partly, yes. But this document, it should be said, is not as specific and well-honed as the political programs of other movements. The "Appeal" merely contains general principles which have been specified in documents included in the association of collective members. It should be said that this is a social organization formed on the basis of the principle of federalism and voluntary association of collective members making their contribution on a constitutional basis to the cause of strengthening Russia as the consolidating point of departure for the USSR, and bolstering the Soviet state as the historic emergence of a united, multinational, socialist motherland.

[Pashayev] Aleksandr Andreyevich, the problem with many informal associations is their lack of constructiveness and gradual slide into positions of blind criticism of state and party organs. Are you sure that the OSR will successfully avoid this?

[Prokhanov] I must say that our congress was held in the context of constructive ideas. It above all expressed constructive programs. In general, I think that the wave of criticism is already ending and receding. The speakers at the congress, whoever they were—priests, ecologists, economists, or workers—talked above all about recovery, building, and recreation. There were constant references from various people to the same danger—preventing dissension and a slide into feuding, discord, and internecine strife. This is pernicious and criminal; history bears witness to that. I do not think that destructive forces will prevail in the future either.

[Pashayev] But surely such problems can be artificially introduced by "extremists," as we say. If we take the Russian movement, such a role could, I think, be played by "Pamyat" supporters or members of the so-called "Democratic Union." Admittedly, they are not part of the OSR, but, as far as I am aware, your association remains open to new collective members.

[Prokhanov] Yes, the council is open to them. But this is an association of like minds whose aim, as I have already said, is broad national consensus. And anything that runs counter to this idea or is out of step with it is unacceptable to us.

Incidentally, "Pamyat" representatives did come to our congress. They were, as always, uninvited and eccentric, and they tried to cause a disturbance. They were asked to leave. They were out of tune with those present because of their extreme right-wing radicalism and the intolerance shown by many points in their program, which seems to us inappropriate, unacceptable, disgusting, and not part of the idea behind our movement.

As for the Democratic Union, it did not even attempt to join with us; it has always been opposed to us. Politically it is indifferent to the national idea, since it is more concerned with active social building along the lines of recreating Western, and particularly U.S. models. The Democratic Union supporters are convinced that if the models of "flourishing societies" were transferred to Russian soil they would produce the same results. We disagree with that, believing that our huge political and ethnic land mass has its own path.

[Pashayev] Aleksandr Andreyevich, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA readers are interested in your association's attitude toward the Army and the processes taking place in it.

[Prokhanov] The attitude toward the Army in society today is ambiguous. As is well known, it has its opponents and ill-wishers. But there are also enthusiastic supporters who, expressing military people's interests, actively engage in argument and defend them from unfair and undeserved slights. I believe that we belong to the latter group. This does not mean, of course, that we do not criticize things that are obsolete, decrepit, out of tune with the times, or a stain on the Armed Forces.

In general, our congress document and particularly the resolution on attitudes toward the Army expressed our attitude to the Armed Forces quite clearly. In our view, in the present geopolitical structure we cannot do without a strong Army and law-enforcement institutions. We consider the idea of setting up armies of hired men or regional army and law-enforcement formations to be highly dangerous. We advocate a genuinely people-based Soviet Army and genuinely people-based law-enforcement organs to defend the state and working people's social gains. A hired army is a sign of society's inevitable disintegration and its moral degradation. A people who do not respect their army are doomed to feed a foreign army. I think it's hard to add anything to that.

Crimean AES To Be Converted to Training Base

PM3110114389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent S. Troyan report: "There Will Be No Crimean AES"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers has decided to retool the Crimean nuclear electric power station [AES], which is under construction. So the 3-year debate over the construction of this facility on the grounds of an all-union health-resort center has ended.

The Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry has been instructed to convert the AES into a training base to train AES maintenance and repair personnel and a scientific engineering center. This center will substantiate designs in the development of similar high-security new-generation facilities. Now only the buildings needed for a major school training power generation and nuclear power specialists will be built near the Arabatskiy Gulf. This does not pose any threat to the environment.

"We have increased concerns," V. Kurashik, deputy chairman of the oblast soviet executive committee, said. "It is hard to find work for hundreds and hundreds of AES construction workers without delay. We are proposing to open a subsidiary of the 'Foton' Association in the settlement manufacturing televisions and a section of the Feodosiya hosiery factory. We are also planning to open a small thermal electric power station here run on gas. We know that economic managers have many difficulties ahead and that a tough power economy drive will be needed."

Azerbaijan People's Front Official Interviewed

LD3110100689 Baku KOMMUNIST in Azeri 28 Sep 89 p 4

["Where Are We Heading?": interview with E'tibar Mamedov, member of the Executive Committee of the Azerbaijan People's Front, by correspondent E. Gadyrov]

[Text] Question: "The process of the dialogue between the People's Front of Azerbiajan and authorities of the republic is arousing excitement among all the people. All see that this dialogue proceeds in a very difficult way. Each has taken a step. How do you assess the process and the preliminary results?"

Answer: "We discuss this at every meeting, and debate it. Reaching agreement on some principled questions, and the fact that positions are coming closer to each other increase hope. I believe that our participation in the work of the parliament of the republic and in the preparation of many decisions, has become a turning point."

Question: "Both the aims and the intentions of the National Front are clear to most people. It does not tolerate bureaucracy, adminstration by injunction and injustice, and it fights for the full sovereignty and welfare of the republic. What about ways of achieving the aims? Are you sure that all subjects are clear to all? After all, only recently we started going to the main school of political struggle and no one is insured against errors."

Answer: "In our speeches at the meetings we have many times said that we regard democracy as the only way to achieve our aims. We are children of restructuring, and it would not be fair not to mention that only restructuring has opened the door of democracy to people. The People's Front is against any violence and application of force."

Question "But let us confess, a number of people who pretend to be 'fighters' for people's work are employing some antidemocratic methods. And there are people who, using the name of the People's Front, are involved in illegal actions."

Answer: "Unfortunately such cases have been observed. During strikes there were cases of stopping buses, using force, and not letting people go to work. Once again, I would like to say that this has nothing to do with the main people's movement. We have frequently repeated that both our strikes and meetings are based only on the principle of conscientious and voluntary participation. We rely not on strength of arms, but on consciousness and political ideas."

Question: "Are you sure all of those who have joined the ranks of the movement share this view and their hearts are beating for the people?"

Answer: "Using the term people, means millions, and claiming that everything is going smoothly in this great task, would be credulity [as published]. Some people who have lost their job, their chair, intend to use the people's movement for their own interest, to put it briefly, for their personal revenge. I liken this movement of the people of Azerbaijan to the sea. Waves will sooner or later bring the slops and dirt to the shore."

Question: "Reports have recently been coming from rayons. Some forces have chosen local ruling bodies as their targets. Ultimatums are being given and resignations are being demanded. They are talking on behalf of the people and people's front."

Answer: "We have also received reports about these cases. There is dissatisfaction about the work of local party organizations in Dzhalilabad, Lenkoran, and Khachmaz. As is known, party bodies' taking control of soviets and their interference in the economy was one of the most harmful phenomena of the period of stagnation. Even now this situation continues, especially in village rayons. As is seen, directing the movement against local bodies has to do with objective reasons. Dissatisfaction is also connected with this. To eliminate this dissatisfaction, rayon leaders must think about completely changing and renewing their style of work.

"However, this does not mean that the rayon branches of the National Front must be involved in the question of changing the leaders of the local ruling bodies. We resolutely state that we are against interference in the party's internal affairs. Because there are forces which are attempting to direct this process for their personal aims, and in order to achieve their aims, they want to use our movement as a means. We believe that local bodies of the People's Front must make efforts for full democratization of administration, and for every organization to fulfill its own functions. Otherwise, our movement may deviate from its main direction.

"If there is any shortcoming in the work of local bodies, a fight must be waged against it. But how? We condemn any action which is against democracy and law, and say: "The people will never follow this way.""

Correspondent on Situation in Stepanakert

LD3010202789

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian in its "Vremya" newscast at 1530 GMT on 30 October 1989 carries a 3-minute video report by A. Barkhatov from Stepanakert under the rubric "Problems of our Federation," outlining the current situation in the region. Barkhatov notes that the problems with fuel remain—there are no reserves and fuel continues to come into the oblast in a haphazard fashion. The video shows a line of vehicles at gas pumps, and an interview with an unidentified man at a gas station who says they are off to visit Azerbaijani friends. The man asserts that for some people, it would be advantageous to exacerbate relations between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, but he says that they are not enemies and will not become enemies.

Barkatov says that for the time being, the blockade of the town and the oblast is continuing and there are still lines for bread which start during the night, despite the curfew situation. The video shows market scenes with few wares or food on display—only potatoes are shown being purchased—and a line for bread nearby. On the subject of refugees, Barkhatov says there are approximately 13,000 in the town, and that the matter of housing is a dire problem. The video shows one room housing with half a dozen people plus belongings and beds. Barkhatov notes there is a shortage of hotels and hostels and that people are living in basements. He says aid sent to the NKAO is still in wagons at the approaches to the oblast.

The video switches to show Barkhatov inside a Stepanakert television studio, with six television sets on a wall next to him. He notes that programs made for broadcast by Stepanakart television are pettily not being relayed in full to the Azerbaijani town of Shusha. Barkhatov says that the confrontation is food for rumors concerning broadcasts and broadcasting times. The video shows a television studio, men playing chess outdoors, a boy carrying bread, and views of rail wagons with smashed windows.

New Uzbek Land, Water Minister Named

LD2810190189 Tashkent SOVET OZBEKISTONI in Uzbek 17 Oct 89 p 1

[Text] Decree:

The Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees to appoint Comrade Rim Abdulovich Giniyatullin as minister of land reclamation and water resources of the UzSSR.

[signed] M. Ibragimov, chairman of the UzSSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. L. Bekkulbekova, secretary of the Uzbek SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. City of Tashkent, 16 October 1989.

'Generations Link' Society Forms in Dushanbe

LD3110142989 Moscow TASS in English 1329 GMT 31 Oct 89

[Text] Dushanbe October 31 TASS—The Paivano (generations link) Society was established here today at a constituent conference. The society will establish and develop cultural relations with over four million Tajiks living abroad.

A major goal of the society is to help them study the history and culture of the Tadjik people. It will also publish a newspaper and a magazine.

"Tajikistan will be used as an example to explain Soviet perestroyka to foreign Tajiks," Society Chairman Mukhiddin Asimi told TASS.

The society has been sponsored by the Tajik Academy of Sciences, the republican society for foreign relations with foreign countries, several unions of cultural workers and the Muslim church.

Further Reforms Urged in Party Apparatus

*PM2410151389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Oct 89 First Edition p 2*

[Article by Doctor of Technical Sciences Professor V. Zhuravlev and party worker M. Kodin: "The Party and Perestroyka. An Apparatus for Policy-Making"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] No system of management can operate without an apparatus. Nor can the party do without it, however some journalists may have excelled at leveling accusations at it of partocracy and so on. The question—should there or should there not be an apparatus?—must be put differently: How can this echelon of managerial technology be transformed (reconstructed, redesigned, organized in a new way, and so on) so that it accords with the new, complex tasks in the best possible way?

The following definite statement was made at a July CPSU Central Committee conference: "We reject the defamation of the party apparatus. We need an apparatus. But we need a new apparatus, capable of performing its functions in a skilled manner and offering elective organs comprehensive assistance."

Thus, the task has been set—we must have a new apparatus, capable of resolving new tasks. How is this to be achieved?

Over the last year the party has taken major steps to cut and change the structure of the party apparatus. The number of Central Committee departments, primarily sectoral departments, has been cut from 20 to 9. There has also been a marked reduction in the apparatus in other party committees. Its reorganization must be accompanied by a radical change in the functions, content, and methods of work of all subunits of party committees' apparatus. It is a question of resolutely eliminating administrative-edict methods, parallelism, duplication, the supplanting of soviet and economic organs, and manifestations of technocracy.

Has the reorganization of the party apparatus achieved its goal? Not entirely, in our view. The "ideology" behind the restructuring of the apparatus was not thought out fully; voluntarism and pressure from above intervened in this process once again, as before. Figures were given and the apparatus structure was adjusted to fit these indicators rather than its new functions. The press, covering the report and election conferences, cited numerous complaints from local party workers that the new party apparatus structure was "triggered" from above without considering the opinion of the grassroots links and the specific situation at local level. At the same CPSU Central Committee conference certain first party committee first secretaries stated unequivocally: Cutting back the apparatus and changing its structure has not yet produced any results; this action seems premature.

In our view, cutting back the apparatus is an objective and pressing phase in the party's life. The whole question is as follows: Why is this being done, and what aims are being pursued? That is, clear concepts of party leadership and its priority directions must be elaborated.

Obviously, the main task of party leadership is to work out its aims and development ideology. The aims should be important, feasible, and morally and ethically irreproachable. But in that case the functions of party organs and their apparatus will be quite different. This is what V.I. Lenin once predicted when he said that our leading organs will increasingly resemble scientific centers. The organization of the party leadership begins and the structure and tasks of the party apparatus are determined with the correct definition of the functions of the party committees and their apparatus.

Presumably, the new apparatus will keep the following most important functions:

Preparation of proposals for elective organs. This will not run counter to the democratization of party life; on the contrary, management theory does not recommend using a collegial organ (a congress, for instance) for the study of any complex phenomenon or political process. When the time comes to adopt a resolution, there must be alternative solutions prepared with the help of the apparatus, involving science, sociological studies, study of public opinion, experiments, and so on.

This will provide an opportunity to avoid "improvised" and "willful" actions in politics and prevent methods that have not proved their worth from being pressed into practice.

Ideological work. This is perhaps the most complex function associated with elaborating a strategy for society's spiritual rebirth and with the struggle for human dignity, moral nobility, the struggle to destroy the wall of spiritual isolation between people, eliminate distortions in interethnic relations, and so on. This work was previously conducted more on paper, while it must now constitute open and honest dialogue with the people, a struggle for the minds and hearts of people and, ultimately, the voters.

The party defended its functionaries for a long time; it is now giving them an opportunity to act as fighters in the stern and principled struggle for the honor, dignity, and renewal of the party.

Participation in administrative management. Of course, the proportion of authoritative methods will lessen considerably but will nonetheless persist. We cannot do without a managerial apparatus here.

Obviously, in order for the party organs' apparatus to begin to function in a new way, it must perhaps be more flexible, more maneuverable, and more adaptable. Of course, good traditions must be prized and carefully preserved. However, the prime demands of the apparatus today are boldness, the quest for new forms, and experimentation, that is, innovation plus traditions. Taste, instinct, sober assessments, initiative, and independence of thought and action are important here.

Perestroyka is impossible without enterprising and innovative people to generate fundamental ideas of development. Unfortunately, this is at present the most vulnerable spot in the work of the party apparatus. A qualitatively new step away from cliches and stereotypes toward creativity comes very hard.

Every level of leadership presupposes the use of its own special methods and means. For central bodies, say, this is the elaboration of strategic principled decisions. For other party echelons, the organizational factor is the crucial one. However, in practice local bodies often try to duplicate the activity of high-ranking bodies or even merely copy their structure and operating methods. This is a direct deviation from scientific methods of leadership. In our view, the creation of a competent apparatus and a body of cultured leaders of all ranks—men who can think independently—should be a requisite element of perestroyka and one of its key components.

The constant influx of fresh forces into the apparatus is ensured by a democratic approach to its formation. This is easily acknowledged in "theory," but how difficult it is for the demands of management science to be realized in our practice!.. The secretive approach to the selection of workers and the stress on convenient personal acquaintances and staunch friends are still firm features. During the years of stagnation an atmosphere of unrestrained servility to superiors took deep root, and smiling conformism and obsequious readiness to unreservedly support the "official" viewpoint and any undertaking by the higher-ups, even if it was known to be foolish, flourished. The consciousness of some party workers turned out to be fairly deformed. When selecting cadres, they ceased to prize the individual and take notice of people with a well-developed intellect and their own credo, yet it is "difference of opinion" that enables society to get to know itself better and look itself in the face.

One must learn to conduct dialogue in the party sphere and listen to and hear other people, including impartial but just words. How can we arrive at the truth, avoid possible mistakes, and provide the most correct assessment of events, people, and facts without a clash of opinions? Academician N.N. Moiseyev, who made the following remark once, is quite right: "Culture is the ability to listen to other people's ideas and not consider oneself an absolute authority... I know from my own experience how difficult it is to fight the desire to speak and replace it with the ability to listen." Is that not why many party workers lose prestige, because they have not yet learned to listen to people and have only mastered Lenin's abiding precept—always be with and learn from the masses—in words rather than reality.

Here is another important element. In our country a party worker's job is not automated in practical terms. His tools are the telephone and the fountain pen. Many people never even dream of personal computers. But life suggests that we will not be able to do without them in the future if we want the apparatus to satisfy the requirements of the time.

The kind of management that considers man's social working conditions, his endeavors and motivation, and his spiritual mood is the most successful and effective. "Human use of human beings" is the motto. This dictates the need for a well-considered approach to reforming the party apparatus along with respect for and a solicitous attitude to good people who work in a contemporary fashion. The apparatus must hold its own scientifically-justified niche in the structure of general state management and party leadership, without supplanting elective organs and the functions of other managerial structures. This will also entitle it to corresponding moral and material rewards. It is not a question of privileges but of just remuneration for its labor. The party apparatus cannot function successfully in conditions of moral discomfort, where constructive criticism is supplanted by labeling.

One is also conscious of the need to elaborate certain, so to speak, legal party documents: theses on the membership of elective organs and the apparatus and on the principles for their mutual relations. They could reflect what we see as the promising practice of filling posts within party committees' apparatus by open competition. It would also be worth providing for reliable social security measures for party workers and at the same time clearly formulating demands relating to their modesty, moral purity, and ideological staunchness.

Party Needs Dialogue With 'Informals'

PM1110141789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Honest Dialogue"]

[Text] One has heard the following statement about perestroyka: "It is a veritable drama in which you have characters in conflict, a fierce struggle between the outdated and the new, and an altering of consciousness.... There is nothing stronger than the drama of life itself."

Indeed, there is nothing more dramatic than altering consciousness. This is evidenced by the entire history of mankind. The teaching of Marx and Engels is the scientific validation of mankind's dream of freedom, equality, and fraternity. We have achieved it through the sufferings of many generations of fighters for the truth. From intuition to abstract thought and from it to practice—this brilliant three-in-one philosophical formula linking dream and action comes from Lenin. And one cannot help taking pride in the fact that it was Great October that laid the foundation for a new formation in the world—the socialist formation.

Not for a long time has our social atmosphere been so full of hunger for renewal. It is a long time since we talked so frankly about everything. It is a long time since we asked one another the kind of trenchant questions we are asking now. Why are we talking? Why are we asking questions? Because we are thinking about life. The emancipation and awakening of the people are very powerfully manifested in the appearance of an increasing number of independent public movements.

How is one to treat this perestroyka phenomenon? It is a question that worries everyone. It concerns everyone too: Top and bottom. It is no secret now that many social and interethnic conflicts could have been avoided if party committees had displayed political flexibility and adopted a firm stance immediately and without delay and had entered into a dialogue with the initiators of public movements boldly and resolutely. One example of this is the Karaganda Party Oblast Committee, which behaved insensitively over the events in mining collectives.

"Failed to display," "failed to enter into" not least because some party organs were hit by a fit of pessimism and defeatism, caused by the massive attacks on the party. The virus of "castigation" of our past has caused confusion and, to be frank, has paralyzed the will not only of party workers, but of many Communists as well. Indeed, let us look at the nature of the criticism that has hit the party like a massive wave. "Omnipotent boa constrictors of the apparatus," "partyocracy," "party functionaries"—this is a by no means complete list of the political labels that have come into user. The extremists have moved on from indiscriminately debunking individuals to setting party against state, and party against people, and to completely removing the party from political leadership. "A country born on the bones of a dead generation," "the ideology of people's violence"—even our rabid ideological opponents have avoided labels as wild as these.

When the CPSU began to lose members, certain people suffering from "leaderism mania" let out a whoop of joy and announced the disintegration of the party. Some 18,000 people have indeed left the party of late. But here is another figure: In the same period more than 20,000 advocates of perestroyka have joined the party. It is true that those who have left include not only "parasites" and "chameleons," but also honest, decent people. May their decisions remain on the conscience of those party workers who were indifferent to the fate of Communists who failed to withstand the storm of moral ostracism.

It is worth noting, however, that the new members include several active members of public movements. Symptomatic, you will agree. This fact indicates that clear-thinking and level-headedness are evident in society and that the desire to consolidate and act creatively and constructively is prevailing. Having taken the initiative in the form of the April change of direction, the party has been and remains the defender of the working class and of the interests of the whole people. It is loyal to the socialist idea and resolutely opposes the authoritarian bureaucratic and command approach to socialism, as well as dogmatism and pseudo-innovation. In fact, all healthy public forces regard this as the aim and purpose of perestroyka, its quintessence. And where mutual understanding exists, the surging tide of democracy acts in favor of perestroyka.

Here are the facts, and they are increasing in number.

More than 10 independent organizations have appeared spontaneously in Chelyabinsk in the past year. The party city committee [gorkom] confessed that for a long time it was embarrassed by the idea of cooperating with them. But the occasion was provided by certain "lovers of the truth," who were virtually forcing their by no means proven opinion upon people, using pickets and rallies, leaflets, and collections of signatures, all organized in accordance with a dubious scenario. But despite all this, party workers managed to uphold their principled line and arrange a constructive dialogue with the informals. Recently their leaders went to the committee and proposed reasonable measures to implement the program to improve city life that had been adopted at a previous party gorkom plenum.

There were dramatic contacts between party organs and activists of the Yaroslavl People's Front. The quest for agreement took place amid wrangling and conflicting opinions. Now the city party organization has found energetic helpers in the shape of such independent organizations as "Memorial," "Working Group," "Ecological Branch," and others in carrying out economic and social transformations.

Back in January 1920 Lenin noted: "Our most acute deficiency is a lack of working people, but we do not know how to recruit ordinary workers and peasants, among whom there is a mass of talent—administrative and organizational."

This idea of Lenin's is more topical than it has even been!

In restructuring their work party committees and primary party organizations are called upon to increase the driving force of perestroyka, involve all healthy movements in the overall effort, and take into account the self-organizing potential that is present among the people. And the surest way to obtain helpers and allies in any environment is political dialogue. Both on general theoretical questions and on specific, practical questions of our life. It was observed long ago that honest and frank discussion is the domain of strong people who know they are right. Real Communists must be able to act in a revolutionary way in the most difficult conditions. There can be no other way today.

Worker Urges Renewal of Party Apparatus

PM3110110189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with S. Kleyko, machine operator at "Nazarovskiy" Open Pit Mine and member of the CPSU Central Committee, by TASS correspondent Yu. Khots, especially for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, in Nazarovo, Krasnoyarsk Kray: "It Is Not Easy To Be a Fighter for Perestroyka. S. Kleyko, Machine Operator at 'Nazarovskiy' Open Pit Mine and Member of the CPSU

Central Committee, Reflects on the Communist Worker's Role in the Renewal of Society's Life"; date of interview not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] "Perestroyka is such a difficult and confusing thing," Stepan Vasilyevich says. "You listen to speakers at a plenum—they all are in favor of perestroyka. Not a single one of them says 'no,' they all agree. But why is everything just dragging along at the local level? Why has the party's prestige declined? Is it only past mistakes that are to blame?... We have learned to make indignant noises, but as soon as it begins affecting you personally, perestroyka falls by the wayside."

[Khots] Are you not laying it on a bit too thick, Stepan Vasilyevich?

[Kleyko] What do you mean, a bit too thick? I heard leaders of party organizations from the Transcaucasian republics speaking at the plenum, and in their opinion everything is in order there, "the situation is stabilizing." But what is actually happening? The secretary of a rayon party committee, together with the militia chief and the local KGB leader, led a mob in blockading highways leading to Armenia. What does this indicate? Grassroot party organizations are not functioning, party discipline is nonexistent. How far can you go in playing up to such moods? If only such leaders were being sacked and taken to court for inflaming ethnic dissension. But no, that is not the kind of news we hear. [passage omitted]

[Khots] And yet you are a member of the ruling party's Central Committee. You could put pressure on those blocking the cause...

[Kleyko] But what can I do? It is not easy to get to departmental leaders in Moscow. I recall how, just before the 19th party conference, the secretary in Minister M. Shchadov's reception room declared that the minister would be unable to receive me—he was engaged, she said. True enough, Mikhail Ivanovich explained afterward that the secretary had been making all the decisions on his behalf... There you have the "bold" decisions sometimes made in our departments. Not in the stagnation years—in our own present! [passage omitted]

[Khots] What do you perceive as the cause of the decline of the party's prestige among the masses?

[Kleyko] If our party is looked at as the sum of all its members, the overwhelming majority are prompted to work by their own conscience rather than by fear. The point is that we have been lenient toward those who flout society's moral criteria. The huge "set" of party demands led to a point at which protectionism, boorishness, and intolerance have not necessarily been a reason for expulsion from the party. And yet a proper person would never accept a boor as a friend. So why do we keep such people in the party? Then we accuse "dark forces" of denigrating the CPSU. And yet we do it ourselves. What is this—a self-destruction of prestige?

[Khots] In other words, radical changes are needed...

[Kleyko] Yes, and a start must be made with the apparatus of rayon, city, and oblast committees. People wish to see on the apparatus their own kind of people—workers, who would not hesitate to sacrifice themselves or their official position for the sake of people's interests. A tendency toward changing the situation is emerging in Krasnoyarsk Kray. A special program for party cadre training has been adopted here. This is where our future lies. But for the time being... Maybe I am laying it on a bit too thick: This does not apply to everything, but you have to wander far and wide in search of the truth. [passage omitted]

[Khots] I can imagine the questions you are asked when you get back from a plenum...

[Kleyko] Right. Generally speaking, I am in favor of party materials being published in full. I am pleased that this was done on the occasion of the last plenum. But this must be the rule; there must be no secrets from the people. For the time being, however, most documents are stamped "secret." This secrecy is nothing but a breeding ground for sundry conjectures. I can understand it when it comes to state security and the country's defense. But what can be secret about agrarian matters? Or the latest address by the CPSU Central Committee to party members, for example? The contents of that letter were heard by virtually the entire people. But I, as member of the Central Committee, received a copy stamped "secret." And if these documents and the data contained in them are "eyes only," how can I deliver a well-argued speech to my audience? How can I make use of the facts and persuade people? [passage omitted]

[Khots] Do you not find it strange that there is not a single worker on the Politburo?

[Kleyko] Not only strange, but also incomprehensible. But there was already a discussion at the last plenum and during M.S. Gorbachev's meeting with workers who are members of the Central Committee. I was solidly questioned on this issue at work. It is not just a matter of "workers keeping an eye on things," even though that is also important. Not for the sake of simple representation but in order to ensure that the decisions being made are more frequently checked against his, the cadre worker's opinion. I would also say this: There must be more workers on the Central Committee itself. The office of oblast committee first secretary or ambassador must not be a criterion for Central Committee membership. Such people have enough authority.

[Khots] What is your greatest worry now?

[Kleyko] Honestly speaking, I had mixed feelings on hearing the news about convening the 28th CPSU Congress. In case we experience again what happened with the election of people's deputies, when we workers ended up the losers. The congress itself may end up as "loser." This will not happen if there are fewer indifferent people.

waiting for changes to be handed down to them from the top. Let me repeat: The party's prestige begins here, in the work place.

[Khots] Stepan Vasilyevich, why don't you speak at the next plenum and express your views on this matter?

[Kleyko] You can take this conversation as theses for a future speech...

Scientists, Intelligentsia Form Informals

90UN0125A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 20 Oct 89 p 1

[Article by Moscow Sevastopolskiy Raykom First Secretary A. Bryachikhin: "The Doors Are Always Open"]

[Text] Perhaps Moscow's Sevastopolskiy Rayon has become acquainted with "informals" sooner than other locales have learned about them. A significant percentage of our employees consist of scientific and scientific-technical intelligentsia. It is no secret that the scientific milieu often exhibits cliquishness and exclusivity in the sphere of dissertational interests, and the dictatorship of the leader here leaves much to be desired with respect to moral-psychological climate. Scientific collectives are often torn apart in secret conflicts or quarrels which take the form of a kitchen squabble. This leads to passivity, apathy, and a lack of faith in the traditional forms of social life. Then, just like mushrooms, you see formations, clubs, associations...accompanying perestroyka.

In 1986 the party raykom began a dialogue with representatives of the "informal" movement. At precisely that time, the first club for interprofessional contact in the rayon sprang up at the initiative of young scientists in the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The club "Democratic Perestroyka" was later formed on this basis and registered with the institute primary organization of the All-Union Economics Society.

Since that time a great many club meetings have taken place attended by tens of thousands of individuals. "Democratic Perestroyka" maintains ties with the Baltic region, with organizations similar to itself. Representatives of the foreign mass media often attend its meetings. The club publishes an informational bulletin entitled "The Open Zone."

The broad spectrum of spontaneous groups and organizations presently existing can be arbitrarily divided into three streams of thought. In the same current as "Democratic Perestroyka" are "Socialist Initiative," "New Socialists," the "Moscow People's Front," "Assistance," and the city of Moscow's party club "Communists for Perestroyka." These organizations have accumulated experience in conducting activity with the masses; they have trained speakers and a developed informational network. The process of consolidating these groups of social-democratic orientation is reinforced on the basis of their support for the platform of the interregional deputy group. On the other hand, they are torn by very sharp contradictions both ideological-theoretical and personal in nature.

The second stream of spontaneous organizations includes "Fatherland," "Russian Patriotic Front," "Russian People's Front," "Remembrance," "United Front of Working People," and "Social Initiatives Fund." These groups adhere to a national patriotic line. Their activity is a reaction to unacceptable—from the point of view of part of the population and working class—Westernist aspirations of the first grouping of "informals," and has also been facilitated by the growth of national self-consciousness related to exacerbated interethnic relations.

Several of these organizations ("Fatherland," "Social Initiatives Fund") are Marxist-Leninist in their orientation.

The third stream of spontaneous groups occupies an intermediate position at present and is represented by such organizations as the historical-educational society "Memorial" and the "Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists." In addition, there is the ecological society "Bittsa," whose leaders are showing ever-increasing interest in problems of territorial self-government.

This classification is rather arbitrary. We have observed that leaders of informal organizations are capable of manifesting inconsistency and unsteadiness of position within the framework of their doctrine for the sake of ringing phrases and striking gestures, simply to light the polemic fuse.

Let us cite one example. The overwhelming majority of "informals" readily makes contact with party organs. They direct the majority of their requests and proposals straight to party functionaries, to use their terminology. Against this background it would seem that they could logically show solidarity with the progressive—from their point of view—party worker, let us say during the course of an election campaign for USSR people's deputies. But this has not taken place in a single instance. It has turned out to be more important for the spontaneous activists to preserve some form of "fighting against bureaucracy."

Almost all of them are, in their words, advocates of more radical reform than what is presently being carried out. In this regard, they often flatly ignore actual economic opportunities and the particular political situation in society. The lurching forward and the leftist phraseology of the "informals" are sometimes accompanied by a lack of theoretical discrimination.

Party workers are thus faced with a complicated task—that of directing this spontaneous activity into the constructive stream of perestroyka.

We refuse no one right off the bat. We strive to influence the conceptual content of activity of various societies and enlist sober minds in the effort to oppose antisocialist groups and individuals. We pursue mutually beneficial ends.

How? Through direct and principled dialogue. The party raykom has become the meeting place. Informational meetings with representatives of the "informals" have been introduced in which secretaries and responsible party raykom individuals, our active membership, take part. When the other side undertakes some venture of its own, party organ representatives go there and we achieve a situation in which participation is not limited to presence.

Our initial experience shows that only creative people who possess a high degree of competence and culture can carry on effective and constructive dialogue, engage in sharp debate.

It was natural to begin by enhancing personal professionalism. A training program was developed jointly with the administration department of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee, in which the aktiv and raykom apparatus were involved. Two game simulations conducted by rayon propagandists, imitating discussion with "informals" of antisocialist persuasion, turned out to be beneficial.

A section for working with spontaneous organizations was established in the ideological department. In addition to its daily contacts and meetings with "informals," this section conducts methodology work. It has a special group of experts, accumulates and analyzes information and press materials, including "Samizdat" materials, which have become more and more numerous in recent times. Secretaries of primary party organizations and their deputies for ideological work have operational information on the situation in the spontaneous-group movement and a program of operations.

Tolerance and respect for one another give us the opportunity to cooperate. We note in this regard that, for the time being, the activity and acuteness of the "informals" enjoys more popularity with the population than does ours. Party organizations are therefore attempting, together with them, to promote more successfully the development of self-government and the population's participation in perestroyka.

We are also engaged in joint efforts seeking a solution to purely internal party problems. To this end, weekly meetings of the Moscow party club "Communists for Perestroyka" are held in the party raykom headquarters. Here you can see raykom secretaries and apparatus workers. At one of the meetings, the party gorkom second secretary, Yu. Prokofyev, was conducting an active, constructive dialogue with the Moscow club.

Open discussions have been held at raykom initiative. They received mass media coverage and were broadcast over radio channels to foreign countries as well.

But here we stop to consider—have we not been engaging too much in fascinating and entertaining—but not always fruitful—dialogues and discussions? At present we are attempting to move onward without losing the baggage we have acquired. Together with the informals we must get away from loud conversations and turn to practical matters. It is extremely important that we accomplish as quickly as possible the specific political, economic, and social tasks which are facing the country, city, and rayon.

We have agreed in principle with the "spontaneous activists" and are earnestly relying on them in the coming campaign for elections to the local soviets. In the preparatory stage, the rayispolkom issued a social order to the majority of spontaneous groups in the rayon regarding development of the concept and practical implementation of the self-government system on the microrayon level. The material obtained was generalized at a recent raykom plenum.

Joint participation in the effort to restructure our life will allow us not only to determine which of the spontaneous organizations are truly worried about the destiny of socialism, but will permit us to involve the population in its renewal as well.

Mass Held for Victims of Stalin Purges

LD3010212389 Moscow TASS in English 2104 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Minsk October 30 TASS—By Tass correspondent Aleksandr Palchevsky:

The mass to honour the memory of the victims of Stalin purges was held by Orthodox Catholic and Lutheran priests in the Kuropaty forest near Minsk, capital of Belorussia.

A year and a half ago a mass burial site of Soviet citizens, victims of lawlessness of 1937-1941 was found there.

The requiem mass was attended by scores of thousands of people. It was organized by non-formal public movements which actively participate in Belorussia's political life, timed to coincide with the day of remembrance for the ancestors traditionally marked in later October.

Early this year the Belorussian Government decided to perpetuate the memory of the victims of massive purges of 1937-1941 in Kuropaty.

A special commission of the leaders of Belorussia, lawyers, historians, public figures, forensic doctors, was able to determine the approximate number of those executed: no less than thirty thousand.

Now an open competition has been announced for a Kuropaty monument. The "Belorussian-Soviet Encyclopaedia" publishers is preparing a special edition which will feature scores of thousands of documents on those tragic events.

Ban on Individual Radio Sets Lifted

PM3110141189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with V. Batashev, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Communications Scientific and Technical Center, by correspondent F. Ivanov: "Radiotelephones Will Broadcast"; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] For many years private individuals in our country were forbidden to use individual portable transceivers. This ban has now been lifted.

Next year radiotelephones and portable "walkie-talkie" type radios produced in this country will appear in the stores. An IZVESTIYA correspondent interviewed V. Batashev, deputy chief of the USSR Ministry of Communications Scientific and Technical Center, on the prospects for the production of this output.

[Ivanov] Viktor Nikolayevich, until recently the majority of Soviet citizens were forbidden to broadcast on the open airwaves on the pretext of the struggle for their purity.

[Batashev] Indeed, formerly only those radio hams who had registered their stationary sets could use radio transmitters. And even then they only had the 40 megahertz frequency. I think this was explained by the distrust which the departments nurtured toward their fellow citizens.

The situation changed very recently when the USSR Ministry of Communications frequency allocation inspectorate assigned a new range of 26-27 megahertz for private transmitters. This gave us the opportunity to begin elaborating a program for the production of portable transceivers for individual use. It must be said that our enterprises were already producing this output, in small consignments, it is true, intended for departments like the Defense Ministry and Ministry of Internal Affairs. Conversion has helped us to release some capacities for the production of consumer goods.

[Ivanov] Describe the new output in more detail.

[Batashev] As regards the radio sets, we will produce several types with different radiuses of operation: from hundreds of meters to 4 km. The cost of one such set will vary within the range of R150-300. Radiotelephones will operate at a distance of up to 400 meters from the telephone installed in an apartment.

[Ivanov] When and where will it be possible to buy these goods?

[Batashev] We will be able to start producing portable radio telephones and radio sets as early as next year. We will distribute them primarily through our "Orbita" company stores. We have now elaborated a long-term program for providing the population with what are as yet unusual goods for us.

[Ivanov] Are you not afraid that the drastic increase in radio sets will seriously clutter up the air and enable some people to listen in to other people's conversations?

[Batashev] I don't think so. We are now working on a special device which will exclude the possibility of meddling in other people's conversations. In addition we hope that new frequencies will be allocated for individual radio sets.

Detective Agencies Unite, Form Group

LD3110064989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1948 GMT 30 Oct 89

[Text] Moscow, 30 Oct (TASS)—Commercial detective agencies which have recently sprung up in various Soviet cities united in the Association of USSR Detective Services, "Aleks", at a constituent conference held here.

In the words of Valentin Kosyakov, chairman of the association, it is not the intention of the commercial detective agencies, in which former mmembers of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB, and the procuracy, jurists, criminology specialists, and sportsmen work, to act as an alternative to the internal affairs bodies. Among the bureaus' services are the protection of citizens' apartments on a contractual basis, the installation of special signal devices in vehicles and other means of transport with the aim of preventing their theft, the assignment of body guards for the protection of interested individuals, guarding the property of joint ventures, cooperatives, and citizens from racketeers, and searching for people on civil actions.

Unfortunately, stated Valentin Kosyakov, there are already some detective agencies functioning in the USSR which by their activity compromise the very idea of a detective service, and there are cases where individuals unsuitable because of their low business and moral qualities turn up in these organizations. It is to combat these phenomena that the association, in which a special service for checking the personnel of detecticve bureaus and monitoring the legality of staff members' activities is being developed, has been set up.

Vyacheslav Runyshkov, chief of the main directorate for combating the embezzlement of socialist property of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, for a number of reasons regards the trend toward the creation of private detective agencies in the fight against crime in the USSR as incorrect and even harmful, insofar as the task of effective supervision of the observation of legality in the activity of these agencies has not been resolved.

Economic

Commission Member Questions Budget Allocations

904A0037A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 22 Oct 89 pp 2-3

[Report on interview with Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin, secretary of the Planning, Budget, and Finance

Commission of the USSR Supreme Soviet, by SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA correspondent Ye. Leontyeva: "How Are We to Overcome the Crisis?"; date and place not specified]

[Text] The coming year will see a turnaround in our lives. These words have been spoken many a time by now by both the plenipotentiary representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government. What is the foundation for beginning this turnaround? Where is the starting mechanism which will get our economy moving at the right speed? A very heated discussion of the draft state plan and budget for 1990 is under way in the commissions and committees of the supreme legislative organ. What program of operation of the national economy is set forth in them? Is it constructive? Will it bring about the desired results? This is the topic of a conversation between our correspondent and Secretary of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission of the parliament Gennadiy Innokentyevich Filshin.

[Leontyeva] Gennadiy Innokentyevich, all of us feel that the deputies are profoundly concerned about the drafts submitted. What is the primary reason for this?

[Filshin] Indeed, the draft 1990 plan and budget give rise to a very profound concern among our deputies, especially among those whose responsibility it is to work with them directly. The nearer the day of their consideration by the Supreme Soviet draws, the more passions rage.

This tense attention is associated with the hope that yet another year will not become a year of failures and miscalculations and will not disappoint the population even more. It is also associated with the fact that both the sharp criticism of planning and financing in the national economy and promises to attempt improving the economic situation in our country were included in almost all electoral programs of candidates. Now the time has come to report on the degree to which the programs proposed then can be fulfilled, and on how staunchly their authors have been following the path of radical transformations.

[Leontyeva] How is the draft submitted by the government assessed in the commissions and committees?

[Filshin] We communicate with all who consider it, and I must say that it causes much dissatisfaction in the Committee for People's Education. It could not have happened otherwise because a mere 2.5 percent of investment is allocated for people's education as a whole. For comparison: In a good college with decent technical facilities, we spend 5,000 rubles to educate one student. In a less decent one, say, where I am from, in Siberia, 1,500 to 2,000 rubles are spent. Meanwhile, in the United States, the count begins at $80,000 per student. The difference is orders of magnitude, whereas we continue to maintain in this sphere the old, residual principle of resource allocation.

The situation in the Health Care Committee is the same or even worse. I was present at the discussion. In this sphere, investments amount to approximately 1.5 percent. This is how we value the health of the nation.

[Leontyeva] Are you in favor of the commissions and committees assuming a "give-me-more!" attitude?

[Filshin] Priorities and criteria for resource allocations are all I am talking about. I maintain that these priorities continue to be subject to inertia. To be sure, many of those who have considered the draft have admitted frankly: On the whole, we understand next to nothing about the nuances of the plan and the budget, but more money ought to be allocated for our item...

[Leontyeva] Will we accomplish much with such an approach?

[Filshin] You see, when the Commission for Industry asks to add money for the fuel and energy complex, the chemical and lumber complex, and metallurgy we may tell them: At present, R410 billion are actually tied up in building industrial facilities! Which other country can bear stretching resources that thin? Nonetheless, the government and the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] show altogether touching concern for these industries. Here is a characteristic fact. Even while this plan was being prepared, a special decision suggested that additional resources of about R8 billion for them be secured.

[Leontyeva] The self-destructing nature of our economy has long been denounced in the most varied forums. All of us are fed up with the fact that all of our plans amount to a tug-of-war to the advantage of the traditionally powerful industries, monopolies which are not at all working to benefit the people. So, have we not been able to overcome this tendency yet?

[Filshin] Yes, the drafts are based on the traditional principle "from the base attained" with sly references to the effect that assignments have been given to everyone, coming up with additional resources is indicated, and so on.

You analyze these materials with experts and get the impression that the government underestimates the situation. I am not making an emotional judgment here but rather one based on an analysis. Let us compare the period when we embarked on vigorous perestroyka with the previous period which we call that of stagnation from the standpoint of using financial resources, and we will see the following. Between 1981 and 1985, the state debt due to inflation increased by a mere R30 billion. From 1985 on, including the 1990 draft plan, it has already increased by more than 300 billion, or 10-fold! Conclusions? Essentially, the government has been solving the problems emerging in a simple manner—by reaching into the bank. So, the trend is maintained, and the new draft contains the same budget deficit of unprecedented proportions and the same unjustified hopes for some internal reserves.

[Leontyeva] The reserves which will all of a sudden start working for unknown reasons?

[Filshin] Exactly. The government again proposes to borrow from the bank the money which does not exist, that is, the money which does not have any base. Therefore, we see that the strategy has not changed, which is what is causing us to be alarmed. If the inflationary processes are not slowed down prices will continue to grow.

Under the circumstances, it is important to concentrate all efforts on creating a consumer market. However, how can the work of consumer-goods industries be put in order if they retain their Cinderella status despite all public pronouncements?

[Leontyeva] Does this also follow from the draft plan and budget as in the case of people's education?

[Filshin] I made it a point to look at the structure of the economy in more than 20 countries of the world, and in no country is the level of investment in the consumer goods industries so low. In any country, their share is 2 to 3 times higher than that of other industries.

However, I am particularly concerned about the aspect of the budget associated with scientific-technical progress. It is noteworthy that at the outset of perestroyka we named two of its main driving forces, two factors of economic growth: creating incentives for more productive labor and genuinely accelerating scientific-technical progress. Please note that at present we either say nothing about the latter or use stock phrases which is what the draft plan and budget suggest. They do not envisage concentrating funds on endeavors which could yield very favorable results.

Moreover, a gigantic quota has now been planned for stimulating the work of enterprises—about 200 billion rubles. Unfortunately, it is not sufficiently focused on developing scientific-technical progress. The enterprises altogether fight it off everywhere. For their part, ministries and departments do not at all consider this the main task having forgotten that this is tied to quality, productivity of labor, and competitiveness of our products.

Meanwhile, in the portentuous report by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on 11 June 1985, which may be called the first landmark of perestroyka, much space was given to a technical and technological breakthrough. At present, the draft plan and budget say in no uncertain terms that no shifts in either the quality of products or the technical level of products will occur. When I ask the question: How are we to close the monstrous gap between us and developed countries—they respond to me: Supposedly, why should we compare ourselves to them? One wonders what happened to the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress to the effect that by 1990 a considerable segment of products should meet world technical standards? They shy away from even talking about it now. According to official data, between 6 and 10 percent of design and technology developments in our country are conventionally in compliance with the current world standard, and the remaining 90 percent are, alas... One wonders what the effect of it is on the quality of tomorrow's products?

We have even carried out a special survey in the Siberian region and credibly established that in the processing industry a mere 6 to 8 percent of equipment meet world standards, and in the extractive industry even less.

Given this, so to say, progress, how are we to reconcile what will not be reconciled: material-technical resources and the plan? By using a very simple operation which is not hard to figure out. Efficiency indicators are taken and raised abruptly without any justification. They just go up, and that is all. Say material intensiveness in our country declined by 0.3 percent; next year it is sort of supposed to decline 7 times faster than in the 4 previous years, and energy intensiveness will decline 3 times faster. What are these if not numbers for show? Writing it up and reporting to the Supreme Soviet and the Politburo, mistaking the desirable for the realistic—apparently, this was the habitual idea of those who prepare such drafts.

[Leontyeva] And all of this is happening at a time when all of us hope for profound economic transformations in our national economy?

[Filshin] Indeed, as you can see. The drafts submitted by the government have caused dissatisfaction among the deputies exactly for the reason that they are aimed solely at cosmetic repairs of the command-administrative system. In essence, a transition to economic methods is being obstructed. Incidentally, this can also be seen from other drafts. Let us look at the draft law on local self-management and self-financing which should somehow take into account the impact of all other fundamental laws—on property, on land use, on enterprises, on cooperatives. It is not at all geared to self-management as an alternative to the command-administrative system but merely amounts to a poorly camouflaged attempt to build self-management into this very system. That is to say, restrictions on self-management from above are openly proposed.

Therefore, we are facing a choice between minor repairs and real perestroyka. Which of these two concepts should be opted for? One concept calls for regarding the enterprise as an independent unit subject to laws and contractual obligations whereas the other concept calls for maintaining various levels of managerial echelons above it.

[Leontyeva] It appears that perestroyka was initially proclaimed as the former concept....

[Filshin] However, for as long as the budget is designed from the top to the bottom it will never conform to this concept because producers of budgetary funds are not interested in boosting them. The point is that the producers themselves get virtually nothing out of this. Look at Irkutsk Oblast, for example. I took interest in it. Its budget revenue at present exceeds 3 billion rubles whereas expenditures for social needs which are retained by the territory come to less than 800 million, and they have not actually changed in the past 10 years despite the 2-fold increase in the budget revenue. That is, there is no connection between the standard of living and revenues of the territory, just as, incidentally, there is no connection between the efficiency of resource use and, once again, the standard of living. Everything is disjointed. Restoring all of these [links] means switching to economic methods of management. Could we do otherwise now that we have seen the command-administrative system bring on the crisis? In turn, attempts to combine what will not be combined discredit the very idea of perestroyka.

[Leontyeva] What are the consequences going to be if the Supreme Soviet adopts the plan and the budget without chnging the principles you have criticized above?

[Filshin] Irreversible changes in the economy may begin. Primarily, chaos in finances will deteriorate. This will definitely cause the populace to protest an assault on its vital rights.

[Leontyeva] Perhaps, there are radical proposals in the drafts as well?

[Filshin] Half-measures and half-steps in an environment of ministerial monopolies are not productive, and we have established that long ago. An attempt to straddle the fence will not bring us success.

It cannot be ruled out that, given the current composition of the Supreme Soviet and its structure convenient for management, a considerable segment of deputies will take the path of half-measures. However, there also is a counterbalance. This is primarily the familiarization of voters and deputies with a tremendous volume of information on the scope of the crisis and a quite natural reluctance to live in the environment of the crisis.

If we do not change our approach to the plan and the budget this will cause an avalanche of amendments and attempts to change in the course of the year what we fail to do now. This, however, will come as a response to the fire rather than the prevention of it.

[Leontyeva] However, in-depth and comprehensive work on the drafts is now under way. What does it consist of?

[Filshin] Abandoning complete regimentation from above and giving more independence to the republics, regions, and enterprises is what we would particularly like to ensure. The main point is for the government to offer to the USSR Supreme Soviet a system of emergency measures for bringing the economy and society out of the crisis. Thus far, it does not exist. For our part, we saw fit to propose the lines along which this system of emergency measures could be developed in the course of joint consideration of the drafts with representatives of the USSR Gosplan, ministries, and departments. Many people agree with it.

At present, we share the responsibility for our country with our government. I hope that this responsibility will prompt many people to think hard.

[Leontyeva] In your opinion, what is the connection between the drafts submitted to you and the structure of power in our country? Is this not the heart of the problem which we are discussing?

[Filshin] It may be. However, I proceed primarily from the need to invert the pyramid of economic management, the apex of which in our country points downward. Primary cells of the economy should become the base of the pyramid. These are the enterprises which manufacture products and the small territorial units in which we live and work.

Commentator Praises Ruble Devaluation

90US0145A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Untitled commentary by M. Berger]

[Text] No matter how prices rage in the black currency market, no matter what fantastic exchange ratios of the ruble to the dollar emerge for individual commodities (up to R20 and more to the dollar in operations with audio and video equipment and even more than R60 to the dollar when world and our state prices for pearls are compared), a report on the 10-fold lowering of the exchange rate of the ruble in non-commercial operations will come as a great surprise to many people. Apparently, the absurdity of the old rate, about 60 to 65 kopecks to the dollar was evident to everyone, but it was viewed as an inescapable fact. Officials were in no hurry to revise the proportions set in an unknown manner, and "unofficial" individuals exploited this incongruity.

For example, if a bank gives a businessman or a tourist visiting our country R600 for $1,000 whereas the black market gives R10,000 and more, the temptation to exchange a large segment of the cash at the unofficial rate is too strong. Actually, it is against the black hard-currency market, to which a considerable segment of the hard currency brought in was diverted, that this more than resolute measure is primarily aimed.

It should be stressed that this rate has been introduced only for non-commercial operations. However, it should be expected that, of course, it will influence the rate for foreign trade transactions. Nonetheless, for now it is just a supposition. Certainly, it will be necessary to revise the exchange allocation for Soviet citizens traveling abroad because at the new rate a mere $30 may be received for R200.

In any event, both the measure already taken by the Gosbank [USSR State Bank] and its possible development in this direction fit in the radical revision of our policy with regard to the entry and exit of citizens from the USSR and will facilitate better compliance with the Vienna agreements.

Economic Statistics, 'Ineffective' Reform Cited

LD2910084389 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 28 Oct 89

[Excerpts] A review of the Soviet Union's social and economic development over the 9 months of this year have been published. Boris Markovnikov now comments.

[Markovnikov] The report is evidence of the serious situation in the Soviet economy. The so much expected stabilization has so far failed to take place. In January through September industrial output was up a mere 2.2. percent, the lowest growth rate over many years. The last 3 months were the worst; the growth rate was a mere 1 percent. The production of many manufactures, including essentials, was on the decrease. Measures to improve finances have so far failed to yield the desired effect. Inflation and retail prices are on the rise. The economic reform has proved ineffective. Conceived as a fundamental reorganization of economic management giving independence to industries and relieving them of petty interferences on the part of government ministries, the reform has run against shallow legislation, and stops halfway. Industriat action and interethnic conflicts, too, have had an unfavorable effect. The statistical report reviews the losses. At the same time it has reistered certain favorable shifts in the economy. [passage omitted]

Is there a chance these economic problems can be overcome at an early date? It seems there is. The economic reform has a great potential. The USSR Supreme Soviet last August introduced amendements to the Law on State Enterprise, removing many of the brakes on the initiative of the manufacuturer. For instance, staffs will be free to choose the form and mode of management. It is likely that the 4,000 effective businesses whose staff leased industrial facilities from the government who have formed concerns or industrial associations will be joined by many more others.

Foreign Trade Figures Released, Examined

LD2710165289 Moscow Maritime Press Service in Russian 0815 GMT 25 Oct 89

[Summary] The following figures on Soviet foreign trade are based on the recently released "Foreign Economic Connections of the USSR":

The gross amount of Soviet foreign trade in 1988 was R132.1 billion an increase of 2.5 percent over 1987.

Imports: R65 billion
Exports: R67 billion

The share of fuel and (?energy) products in USSR exports decreased from 46.5 percent to 42.1 percent of all income of hard currency from export sales.

The Soviet Union imported machinery, equipment, and transport machinery to the value of R26.6 billion—40.9 percent of cost of all imports.

The Soviet Union imported ships and naval equipment to the value of R1.7 billion.

The Soviet Union imported grain from:

The United States: 17.5 million tonnes
Canada: 5 million tonnes
France: 3.4 million tonnes
Argentina: 1.8 million tonnes (approximately)
China: 1.5 million tonnes
Hungary: 1 million tonnes
Great Britain: 1.1 million tonnes

A total of 35 million tonnes of grain was imported at a total cost of R2,363.3 million.

Soviet trade turnover with CEMA countries in 1988 was R78.9 billion—0.8 percent less than 1987. Trade developed with Western industrial countries increased 10.4 percent to a total of R31 billion, trade with China increased by 25.4 percent and with North Korea by 30 percent.

The total amount of Soviet foreign trade in 1988 was 522.2 million tonnes gross; 52.9 percent of it was shipped by Soviet maritime fleet.

As of 1 January 1989, 191 joint venture enterprises were registered in the Soviet Union—164 of them in partnership with Western industrial countries, including 30 with FRG, 13 with the United States, and 1 with the UK.

Arctic Fleet Ends Work, Chartered in Pacific

PM3010131789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under the "Russian News" rubric: "Off to the South Seas"]

[Text] Nakhodka, Maritime Kray—The Arctic shipping season is over for the Maritime [Primorskoye] Shipping Line's tanker fleet. The Belogorsk ice-strengthened oil tanker delivered the last tonnes of fuel to the Far North's ports yesterday. The crew not only supplied the outlying parts of this harsh region but also provided services as a mini-icebreaker, leading river vessels along the Kolyma River to their destinations.

There were 18 ships from Nakhodka taking part in supplying the Arctic ports with energy-source cargos. The seamen coped with their task before the Arctic Ocean ice reached the coastline, supplying the northerners with enough fuel for a full year.

The tanker fleet is now southward bound. The shipping line has concluded a series of profitable contracts with foreign firms, and the Far East seamen will be working with charterers from Australia, New Zealand, and other countries.

Military

Official Discusses Aims and Tasks of 'Shield'

PM2610130589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Correspondent A. Davydov report: "'Shield' Will Protect From Injustice"; first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The constituent congress of "Shield"—the Union for the Social Protection of Servicemen, Military Reservists, and Their Family Members—has taken place in Moscow. More than 100 delegates from 39 cities in the country, representing 4 union republics, participated in the work of the congress. The statutes and program principles of the new public organization were approved. IZVESTIYA correspondent A. Davydov asked Reserve Lieutenant Colonel Vitaliy Georgiyevich Urazhtsev, cochairman of the union's board, to describe its aims and tasks.

"The chief reason that prompted us to unite," Urazhtsev said, "is that the socioeconomic disorder that exists in the life of the country today is not bypassing the military. The press has recently written a great deal about the difficulties being experienced by Army and Navy personnel. No lesser burdens—both material and moral—fall to the lot of those who transfer to the reserve. Veterans of the war in Afghanistan have many problems, you know. The extensive reduction in the size of the armed forces, which is being implemented today, has become a real disaster—I will not shy at this word—for thousands upon thousands of people who are now former servicemen. Their adaptation to civilian life is not proceeding as easily as it might seem. These citizens and their family members have virtually been left to their own devices....

"We initiators of the new public movement have been given special energy by the knowledge that, so it turns out, unions for the social protection of servicemen or, more accurately, servicemen's trade unions exist, for example, in all the countries of the NATO bloc which confronts us. In the FRG, for example, there is the Bundeswehrverband, which watches over soldiers and officers who, on joining the ranks of the Armed Forces, lose much of what the civilian population possesses. Special attention is devoted there to ensuring servicemen's social rights.

"Do we really not have similar problems? We know, for example, of many cases where people with an active civic stance and a heightened sense of justice and highly rated specialists are being cut back nowadays. It is no coincidence that approximately 40 percent of our union members are servicemen who have been transferred to the reserve precisely during the present reduction in Army and Navy strengths.

" 'Shield' unites more than 400 servicemen and military reservists. We have a submarine commander, a military unit commander.... The coordinating council includes USSR people's deputies, in particular Lieutenant Colonel V.S. Podziruk and I.I. Zaslavskiy, who is deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for the Affairs of Veterans and Invalids. A specific program of material and moral assistance for those who have an acute need for it was outlined during the work of the congress. With our union's assistance it is planned to create a special store for soldiers' mothers, which will stock everything necessary at the most modest prices. We plan to organize a number of cooperatives: People who have been obliged to leave the armed forces will be able to show their worth and reveal previously untapped abilities, skills, talents....

"Our movement is growing at quite a rapid pace and, if this process continues, we reckon on soon raising the question of creating a servicemen's trade union on the basis of 'Shield,' which will, of course, have considerably wider potential."

Weapons Stolen From Military Unit Near Moscow

PM3110100189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 89 Second Edition p 6

[A. Gomonov and N. Modestov dispatch: "Nine Sacks... of Pistols. United Front Against Crime"]

[Excerpts] In the early evening a telephone rang on the duty officer's desk at the Moscow Oblast Soviet Executive Committee [Oblispolkom] Internal Affairs Main Administration. It was reported that a daring robbery had been committed at a military unit. Sixty-four "TT" pistols and 16 cases containing 5,000 cartridges were stolen.

In order to understand the reaction to the report, let us note that the theft of even one pistol, without ammunition, is an emergency: Dozens of people respond to the alert and an operations group is formed. Now hundreds of weapons had been stolen, along with ammunition! Who stole them? What for?

Personnel from the special administration to combat organized crime recently formed under the Moscow Oblispolkom Internal Affairs Main Administration took part in the investigation. In order to facilitate the search, the area where the crime took place was cordoned off.

"Every minute counted," one of the leaders of the operation, Militia Colonel A. Kartashov, explained. "We found out who was guarding the weapons dump on the night of the robbery. One of the soldiers admitted that he had helped an officer and two strangers to load boxes into a vehicle. They took the weapons into the forest and hid them at the bottom of a quarry 1 and ½ km from the military subunit. The identity of the officer was established. Some of the group immediately went to his place of residence. The rest drove to the quarry." [Passage omitted].

The suspects were detained, but the operation was far from over: No weapons were found in the quarry. Only the charred remains of the boxes in which they had been kept could be found. Obviously the robbers had managed to transfer the weapons to another hiding place. But, by a fortunate coincidence for the operations group, they came back to the quarry to finally destroy all traces of the cache.

At first, the detainees denied participating in the robbery and refused to say where the weapons had been moved to. The first to break was the taxi driver, and the two other robbers followed suit. Some of the weapons were found in a private apartment in the town of Dolgoprudnyy near Moscow. But the lion's share—nine canvas sacks full to the brim with pistols—was found in the taxi driver's private garage in the settlement of Mamontovka near Moscow.

Criminal proceedings have now been instituted on charges of stealing weapons. The investigation is being led by the military prosecutor's office. For the time being, we are not naming the criminals, but one conclusion comes to mind already. The growth in crime now means that extraordinary measures must be taken: the militia must reinforce its technical equipment, and the law enforcement organs must be materially strengthened. [Passage omitted].

'Experienced Crew' Involved in Kamchatka Air Crash

PM3010145189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Oct 89 First Edition p 5

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondents Lieutenant Colonel S. Levitskiy and Lieutenant Colonel V. Usoltsev under the rubric "We Report the Details": "What Happened in Kamchatka"]

[Excerpts] An AN-26 was heading for Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy from a distant garrison. It began its descent to Petropavlovsk airfield under the air traffic controller's supervision. At 1458 hours local time (which is 9 hours ahead of Moscow time) the aircraft's signal disappeared from the radar monitoring screen. At that moment the AN-26 was approximately 30 km from the airfield. At 1745 hours the aircraft's shattered fuselage was discovered by rescue workers on the northern slope of a mountain (at an incline of around 70 degrees, 1,500 meters above sea level). The strong wind and cloud cover prevented a landing from the air. Rescue parties were sent to the accident scene on foot. At dawn on 27 October the report was received that the crew and all the passengers were dead.

A commission headed by Lieutenant General I. Sergeyev has been set up to investigate the causes of the disaster. The accident rescue detachment is continuing work. [Passage omitted]

Here is a brief commentary from Colonel A. Kostin, chief of the Far East Military District Air Force search and rescue and parachute service:

"The plane was being flown by an experienced crew. Communication with them was constant throughout the flight. The plane was flying at an altitude of 5,400 meters.

"During the descent the crew began to deviate to the left of the descent path, as the flight controller constantly warned the airmen. Then contact with the crew suddenly broke off. At 1515 hours the order was issued for an AN-12 with a rescue team on board to take off. Naval aircraft and helicopters belonging to the Ministry of Civil Aviation, the Air Force, and the USSR KGB border troops as well as ground groups joined in the search. Very soon we learned that a tragedy had occurred."

Party Aktiv Discusses Bullying, Other Problems

PM2610153389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 First Edition p 2

[Report by Guards Lieutenant S. Lagodskiy: "Aktiv Meeting Began With Movie"]

[Text] Central Group of Forces—The party aktiv meeting in the unit where Officer V. Sinchurin serves began unusually—with the showing of a movie. It was made at the local "Rodina" Television Studio and was devoted to the division's 50th anniversary. But the movie not only told of the veterans who had arrived for the celebrations and the guards' military feats. A substantial proportion of the movie was concerned with discussing the complex, serious problems encountered today by party and All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League activists: Bullying and interethnic relations in military collectives.

These questions were the focus of the party aktiv meeting, which was addressed by Lieutenant General B. Sharikov, member of the Military Council and chief of the Central Group of Forces Political Directorate.

Military Training Chiefs Address Conference

PM2610091389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Conference of Higher Education Establishment Leaders"]

[Text] A conference of military training establishment leaders is being held in Moscow.

The participants have heard reports by the following: Colonel General V.A. Vostrov, chief of the Military Training Establishments Main Directorate; Colonel General A.K. Mironov, deputy chief of the Cadres Main Directorate; Colonel N.F. Karasev, chief of the Main Political Directorate of the Soviet Army and Navy Social Sciences Department; and Lieutenant General S.A. Korennyy, chief of administration of the Central Finance Directorate, on work by higher education establishments to restructure the training and education process.